Christology and Eucharist in the Early Thought of Cyril of Alexandria

Lawrence J. Welch

International Scholars Publications

Christology and Eucharist in the Early Thought of Cyril of Alexandria

Lawrence J. Welch

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Welch, Lawrence J.
Christology and Eucharist in the early thought of Cyril of Alexandria/
Lawrence J. Welch
169 p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 1-883255-13-8 (cloth): $59.95--ISBN 1-883255-06-6 (pbk.): $39.95
1. Jesus Christ--History of doctrines--Early church, ca. 30-600. 2. Lord's Supper--History--Early church, ca. 30-600. 3. Bible. N.T. John--Criticism, interpretation, etc.--History--Early church, ca. 30-600. 4. Cyril, Saint, Patriarch of Alexandria, ca. 370-444. Commentary on John. I. Title
BT198.W4525 1993
232'.092--dc20 93-31835
CIP

Editorial Inquiries:
International Scholars Publications
P.O.Box 2590
San Francisco, CA 94126
(4150 397-9525

To order: (800) 99-AUSTIN

For my Mother and Father,
my first teachers
in the faith

Acknowledgements

This monograph, the basis of which is my dissertation written at Marquette University, would not have been possible without the advise, encouragement and expert assistant of a number of people. Joseph Lienhard, S.J., Earl Muller, S.J., Donald Keefe S.J, William Kurz, S.J., Dr. Alexander Golitzen, and Dr. Ronald Feenstra all read various drafts of this monograph and offered invaluable comments and criticisms. I want to thank my colleagues at Loyola University Chicago who encouraged me to complete this project especially when it seemed it would never be finished. I especially want to thank Harry Gensler, S.J. of the Philosophy Department who gave me his unselfish and expert technical support in the often bewildering world of computer software.

I am also grateful to Christopher Thompson, Michael Naughton, and Brian Kane for many fruitful hours of discussions about my work. My conversations and electronic correspondence with Joseph Hallman and John J. O'Keefe led me to refine and clarify a number of my views with regard to Cyril's thought. Profs. Hallman and O'Keefe also offered valuable criticisms of a draft of chapter One. I owe an unpayable debt of thanks to my wife Shawn, who shared, sometimes endured, the ups and downs of my research. This monograph would never have seen the light of day without her unfailing support.

Lawrence J. Welch
Chicago, Winter, 1994

Foreword

The late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries were, par excellence, the age of the history of dogma. The names Adolf von Harnack, Friedrich Loofs, and Rudolf Seeberg, all Protestant historians, stand out; but they were hardly the only scholars to write survey histories in that era. Von Harnack believed that dogma itself was a betrayal of true Christianity; hence it is ironic that, in the course of time, so many of his judgments took on the characteristics of dogma.

In recent decades, students of early Christianity have realized that more than a few standard judgments, often repeated unthinkingly since the era of Harnack and others, badly needed rethinking and, in many cases, reformulation. The classic histories of dogma were, often enough, based on a fairly narrow selection of texts from the Fathers of the Church. Often enough, too, these texts were drawn from dogmatic works written in the heat of controversy. By comparison, the Fathers' exegetical works were neglected. Such neglect can be understood. Patristic exegesis can be a long-winded affair, and the Fathers seldom passed up a chance to explain a word or a thought that interested them; the same word or thought may not interest us.

Lawrence J. Welch, in his book *Christology and Eucharist in the Early Thought of Cyril of Alexandria*, makes a fine contribution to the needed process of rethinking judgments about the Fathers of the Church and the emergence of Christian doctrines. His subject is Cyril of Alexandria, the impassioned patriarch of Alexandria who was able to draw more personal dislike and animosity upon himself

than any other Father, even Jerome. Welch concentrates on Cyril's early Christology and, in particular, on his understanding of the role of Christ's human soul. He examines in detail Cyril's Commentary on John.

It has been said, and said rightly, that, had the New Testament not contained the Gospel according to John, Christianity today would be so different as to be nearly unrecognizable. Cyril studies this crucial gospel verse by verse, and takes advantage of the many opportunities it offers to comment on the person of Christ. Welch shows that Cyril read John through a Pauline optic. Cyril's concerns for the work of Christ, and for the Eucharist, shape his understanding of the Spiritual Gospel. Welch's study demonstrates that the doctrine of the person of Christ could not, in Cyril's mind, be considered apart from the doctrine of salvation, or from the Church's worship. Welch is able to conclude that one standard judgment about Cyril needs correction: to use Alois Grillmeier's category "Logos-sarx" of Cyril's Christology before the Council of Ephesus is not accurate; Cyril saw a significant role for the human soul of Christ, even at that early period.

But this one conclusion is only part of the value of Welch's book. He has made a careful study of an important exegetical work by an even more important Father of the Church. He has shown that Cyril, like so many other Fathers, cannot be accused of "thinking in the static categories of being," a common if uninformed charge. Rather, Welch can describe Cyril as "a Christian thinker seized by an insight which is at once soteriological and eucharistic: the union of the baptized in the Spirit with Christ to the Father."

Welch's book can be recommended both for the valuable new insights into Cyril's thought that it provides, and as an example of the type of careful study that brings forth authentic new insights and judgments on a crucial topic in historical theology.

Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J.
Fordham University
The Bronx, New York

Introduction

Few scholars would dispute the fact that Cyril of Alexandria is one of the most important figures in the history of the development of the church's christological doctrine. Cyril's thought is best known in reference to the Council of Ephesus which proclaimed Mary Theotokos and condemned christological dualism. The Alexandrian Patriarch never tired of insisting upon the unity of Christ and this insistence exercised an enormous influence upon patristic Christology. The continuing Christological controversies in the East after Chalcedon often had to do with the proper interpretation of Cyril's theology. Indeed, not long after the death of Cyril, Egypt withdrew from communion with the rest of the church over loyalty to his teaching. No less a scholar than Alois Grillmeier has written that Cyril's christological writings after 429-30 helped to the lay the foundations of the Chalcedonian distinction between nature and person because Cyril's thought upheld the unity of Christ without failing to distinguish between the divinity and humanity of Christ.[1] In Grillmeier's estimation Cyril's writings after the Nestorian crisis finally transcend the Eastern Logos-sarx Christology because Cyril came to recognize the theological significance of the soul of Christ.[2] According to Grillmeier the Cyril's later christology is a synthesis of the best principles of the Logos-sarx and the Word-Man christologies. Grillmeier argued that Cyril's special contribution lies in the fact that he preserved the consciousness that the

[1] Alois Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradtion,* tr. John Bowden, 2nd ed., (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975) 482.

[2] Ibid., 474-75.

incarnation involved a substantial relationship between the Logos and human nature. Grillmeier pointed out rightly that for Cyril, like his great predecessor Athanasius, the Logos was not co-joined to a man, but the Logos really and truly became man.[3]

Many modern scholars come to less favorable conclusions in regard to Cyril's early Christology, especially the Christology of works written before the Nestorian crisis. More than one scholar has argued that Cyril's thought before 429-30 did not advance in any significant way beyond the Christology of Athanasius.[4] Cyril's early Christology is often described as a Logos-sarx Christology where the human soul of Christ is passive. This presentation of the early thought of Cyril sees little evidence that Cyril's early christological writings recognized a human psychology in Christ.[5] These conclusions in regard to the early Christology of Cyril is made almost solely in reference to Cyril's early polemical writings.[6] Yet the vast majority of Cyril's writings before 429-30 are commentaries on the scriptures. Cyril was first and foremost an interpreter of the scriptures. Jacques Liébaert, who thought that Cyril's early thought barely went beyond that of Athanasius, nevertheless, remarked in 1965 that a real understanding of the Christology in Cyril's writings before the Nestorian controversy had yet to be acquired and that these early writings had received little attention.[7] Most of Cyril's early writings are commentaries upon the scriptures. It is only until recently that Cyril's biblical commentaries and the Christology therein have begun to receive the attention they deserve.[8] The volume of these biblical commentaries written before

---

[3] Ibid., 477.

[4] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradtion,* 414-417; See also Jacques Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle Nestorienne,* (Lille, 1951) (Hereafter cited as *La Doctrine Christologique*); J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines,* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978) 322-323

[5] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradtion,* 415. Grillmeier at p.476 argues that Cyril came to recognize a human psychology in Christ during the Nestorian crisis. See also Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique*, 124.

[6] Grillmeier's work is a good illustration in this regard. While Grillmeier recognizes that Cyril's *Commentary on John* is a source of Cyril's early Christology, his description of Cyril's early Christology is drawn solely from the *Thesaurus* and the *Dialogues on the Trinity.*

[7] Jacques Liébaert, "Christologie: Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon (451)", *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* eds., M. Schmaus und Alois Grillmeier, v.3, pt.1a, (Freiburg: Herder, 1965) 105.

[8] Most notably, Robert Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971) (Hereafter referred

429-30 is enormous: two commentaries on the Pentateuch (*De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate*[9] and *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum*[10]); a commentary on the minor prophets,[11] a commentary on Isaiah,[12] and a *Commentary on John.*[13] Cyril also wrote two polemical works before 428: the *Thesaurus,*[14] where Cyril answers "Arian"[15] objections to the consubstantial Trinity, and another anti-Arian work, *Dialogues on the Trinity.*[16] There is general agreement among scholars that the *Commentary on John* together with the *Thesaurus* and the sixth dialogue of the *Dialogues on the Trinity* constitute the sources of Cyril's early Christology.[17]

The *Commentary on John,* by far the longest of Cyril's biblical commentaries, is the most important source for the Christology of Cyril's biblical exegesis. Cyril's Christology is more developed in this commentary than in his Old Testament commentaries. Robert Wilken has pointed out that the principal theme of Cyril's Old Testament commentaries focuses upon the relationship of Christianity to Judaism. In his Old Testament commentaries, Cyril was concerned with showing that Christianity is the transformation of Judaism into a better way of life.[18] For Cyril, Judaism foreshadowed and foretyped the Christian truth and way of life. Of course at the heart of Cyril's view of the relationship between Judaism and

---

to as *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*); Lars Koen, *The Saving Passion, Acta Universitatis, Upsaliensis 31* (Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1991).

9 *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate,* P.G. 68, 133-1125.

10 *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum,* P.G. 69, 9-678.

11 P.E. Pusey, *Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas,* vv. 1-3, (Oxford, 1868).

12 *In Isaiam,* P.G. 70, 9-1449.

13 The best Greek edition of this commentary is P.E. Pusey's, *Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Ioannis euangelium,* vv.3, (Oxford, 1872, reprint ed., Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1965).

14 *Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali trinitate,* P.G. 75, 9-656, hereafter cited as *Thesaurus.*

15 I use the term "Arian", for want of a better one, to refer to various grades of non-Nicene thought. Cyril, himself, however inaccurately, used variations of this word in this way. The term itself can be very misleading which is why throughout this work the term is offset by inverted commas.Here I follow the suggestion of Rowan Williams who has urged that "The time has probably come to relegate the term to inverted commas and preferably to oblivion ...." See his review article " R. P.C. Hanson's Search for the Christian Doctrine of God" *Scottish Journal of Theology,* 45 (1992) 101.

16 *Dialogues Sur La Trinité.* ed. G. M. Durand, Sources chrétiennes. v. 231, 235,246 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1976-78)

17 Grillmeier adds to this list Cyril's Easter Festal Letter of 420: *Homilia 8,* P.G. 77, 565B-577A. See *Christ in Christian Tradition,* 415, n.2

18 Wilken, *Judaism And The Early Christian Mind,* 69-92.

Christianity is his conviction that in Christ the types of Judaism have been transformed into truth. To this extent it can be said that Cyril's Old Testament commentaries exhibit a Christology. While Cyril certainly does not abandon this perspective in his *Commentary on John* his Christological concerns are different. In the latter work Cyril is interested in giving a more specific and detailed description of the person of Christ and his saving work.

Cyril's *Commentary on John* is a verse by verse commentary on the gospel according to the fourth evangelist. A concern for refuting "Arianism" partly shaped this commentary and Cyril frequently takes up an anti-Arian polemic. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to regard this commentary as simply concerned for answering "Arianism". Cyril was a Christian bishop who quite naturally interpreted the Christian scriptures for his flock. In the Introduction to the *Commentary on John* Cyril explains that, although it is very diffucult to interpret the divine mysteries, his commentary is written out of his duty as a priest to teach the people what they ought to learn. Also, as bishop of Alexandria, Cyril probably wrote his commentary with his priests in mind, who were required to preach on the scriptures and needed reliable guides that would help them interpret the scriptures authentically. Cyril ends his introductory remarks saying that he also intends, to the best of his ability, to refute false doctrines. At various points in his *Commentary on John* Cyril argues against those who teach that the Son is inferior to the Father. In the later books of the commentary, Cyril writes in opposition to unnamed christological dualists. The bishop of Alexandria's effort to refute false doctrine often shape the very questions he puts to the gospel according to John.

Robert Wilken has noticed that for Cyril, Paul was the key to interpreting the scriptures. Cyril was interested in the Paul who saw Judaism fulfilled in Christ, the Paul who in order to put on Christ no longer observed the law, the Paul who said that the "law condemns to death but the Spirit gives life". Cyril was especially interested in the Paul who saw human history divided into the time of the first Adam and the time of the second Adam. Wilken pointed out that Paul's idea of the second Adam equipped Cyril with a symbol for interpreting all of the scriptures.[19] All this is especially true of Cyril's *Commentary on John* where it is clear that Cyril read the fourth gospel with Pauline eyes and where Paul's idea of the Christ as the second Adam occupies a prominent place.

---

[19] Ibid., 227f.

The *Commentary on John* reveals that Cyril's soteriological and eucharistic concerns shaped and governed his christology. For Cyril, salvation has to do with the union of Christians to the Father through Christ in Spirit. This salvation is communicated through the eucharist where Christians, by the power of the Spirit, partake of the life-giving flesh of the only Son of the Father who emptied himself out into the form of a slave. The *Commentary on John* shows that Cyril's understanding of redemption, his understanding of Christian worship, and his Christology are not separated or isolated from one another. If one pays careful attention to Cyril's *Commentary on John* it is clear that the traditional Logos-sarx description of Cyril's early christology is not accurate.

This study, which aims at re-accessing Cyril's early Christology, focuses primarily on Cyril's *Commentary on John.* I have, however, found it necessary at various points in this study to refer to certain parts of Cyril's other works written before the Nestorian Controversy. It is my view that modern scholars, even those who have begun to describe the Christology of Cyril's biblical commentaries, have not fully noticed the way Cyril's soteriological and eucharistic interest governs his understanding of Christ. This study of Cyril's early Christology is part descriptive, part analytical. I describe not only the inter-relationship between christology, soteriology and eucharistic theology in Cyril's thought, but, I also point out when and where Cyril is consistent or inconsistent in his theological presuppositions and how it effects the unity and coherence of his thought.

A) A note on the Commentary on John

The best edition of Cyril's *Commentary on John* is P.E. Pusey's late nineteenth century edition.[20] We are fortunate that most of Cyril's *Commentary on John* is extant. Books 1-4 (Cyril's comments on John 1-10:17) and Books 9-11 (Cyril's comments on John 12-21:25) have come down to us intact. Books 7 and 8 (Cyril's comments on John 10:18-12:48) exist only in fragments in the catenae. Some of these fragments are Syriac translations of the Greek. While P.E. Pusey edited these fragments for his edition of Cyril's *Commentary on John* the authenticity of these passages are still not certain. To draw conclusions on the basis of

[20] *Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis euangelium,* vv.3, (Oxford, 1872, reprint ed., Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1965) Hereafter cited as *In Joannem.*

these books is both risky and unwise. For this reason books seven and eight are not studied in this work.

In this work, quotations of passages from Cyril's *Commentary on John* are taken from P.E. Pusey's and Thomas Randall's English translations of Pusey's Greek edition.[21] The English of these translations is archaic. I have smoothed out the English in various spots and in some citations I have re-worked Pusey's or Randall's English translation. When I cite the *Commentary on John* I give the book and chapter number of the commentary followed by the volume and page number of Pusey's or Randall's translation followed by the volume and page number of the 1965 reprint edition of Pusey's Greek edition of the Commentary, *Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis euangelium.*

B) The Date and Chronology of Cyril's Writings.

This work studies Cyril's early Christology and his understanding of the eucharist mainly from the perspective of his *Commentary on John* which was written before the Nestorian controversy. Most scholars follow the chronology of Cyril's works that Georges Jouassard proposed in 1945.[22] There is however still some dispute over the precise dating of Cyril's works before 428.[23]

According to Jouassard, Cyril's commentaries on the books Old Testament are his earliest works. We possess complete copies of only four of Cyril's Old

[21] Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the gospel according to S. John,* tr. P.E. Pusey, v.1 (Oxford: James Parker and Co.,1874); *Commentary on The Gospel according to S. John,* tr. Thomas Randall, *Commentary on The Gospel according to S. John,* v.2, (Oxford, 1885). Here after I refer to both translations as *Commentary on John.*

[22] Georges Jouassard, "L'activité littéraire de saint Cyrille Alexandrie jusqu'à 428", *Melanges Podechard,* (Lyons, 1945): 159-174; "La date des éscrits anti-ariens de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue benedictine,* 87 (1977): 172-178. So Alexander Kerrigan, *Cyril of Alexandria: Interpreter of the Old Testament,* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1952) 12f; Robert Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind,* 4, 69; Lionel Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983) xvii, n19; Lars Koen, *The Saving Passion,* 24.

[23] For a chronology different from Jouassard's, see N. Charlier "Le Thesaurus de Trinitate" de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie, questions et critique littéraire," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 45 (1950), 25-81; Charlier dates the *Thesaurus* around 412 (towards the beginning of Cyril's episcopate) and thinks that the *Commentary on John* was Cyril first biblical commentary. See also Jacques Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle Nestorienne,* (Lille, 1951): 12-16. More recently A. Grillmeier follows Charlier's chronology see Alois Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition,* 415 n.2.

Testament commentaries: two commentaries on the Pentateuch, *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate* and *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum,* one commentary on the minor prophets and a commentary on Isaiah. We know from the catenae that Cyril probably authored commentaries on the books of Numbers, Kings, Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Job, Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezekiel, and Daniel. These commentaries survive only in fragments. Scholars read this fragments with some caution because that have not been critically edited.

Jouassard argued that Cyril's two commentaries on the Pentateuch, *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate* and *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum,* his commentary on the minor prophets, and his commentary on Isaiah, were written in that order before 423.[24] Jouassard noticed that Cyril's Old Testament commentaries rarely attack Arianism and do not contain long passages against this heresy. Cyril's anti-Arian polemics are found in his Easter letter of 424, the *Thesaurus*, the *Dialogues on the Trinity,* and numerous passages in the *Commentary on John.* Jouassard reasoned that if Cyril had written his Old Testament commentaries after these works he would not have dropped the anti-Arian polemic. Thus these Old Testament commentaries must antedate Cyril's anti-Arian works.

Jouassard pointed out that the *Thesaurus* was written before the *Dialogues on the Trinity* and the *Commentary on John.* In the preface to the *Dialogues on the Trinity* Cyril mentions that he writes again for Nemesinus to whom he dedicated the *Thesaurus.* The latter work is also mentioned by name in the *Commentary on John*, specifically in Cyril's comments upon John 1:4.[25] Cyril refers to the *Dialogues on the Trinity* by name in his comments on John 1:13 in the *Commentary on John.*[26] Thus the *Thesaurus* was written first, then the *Dialogues on the Trinity* followed by the *Commentary on John.* This latter work was most likely written over a number of years and Jouassard argued that it was complete by 428. It most certainly was written before the Nestorian controversy. The word *Theotokos* never appears in the commentary and Cyril uses loose terminology in reference to Christ that he later takes great pains to avoid during and after the

[24] At least two passages in *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate* refers to a future second book on the Pentateuch (P.G. 69, 16b; 538d). There are also references in the *Glaphyra* to *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate* (P.G. 69 16B; 538D).

[25] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.1 Ch.7 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 63; *In Joannem*, v.1, 181)

[26] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.1, 9 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 108; *In Joannem,* v.1, 138)

conflict with Nestorius.[27] Jouassard suggested that the *Thesaurus* was written between 423 and 425 and that Cyril completed the Dialogues on the Trinity by 425.[28] However, Georges de Durand, who has edited the critical edition of the Dialogues,[29] submits that the Dialogues were completed before 420. This of course would mean that the *Thesaurus* was also written before 420.

Jouassard was silent upon the dates of Cyril's remaining commentaries on the books of the New Testament. We know from the catenae that Cyril wrote commentaries on Matthew, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Hebrews. These commentaries are extant only in fragments. The fragments from the commentary on Matthew have been edited into a critical edition.[30] It is difficult, of course, for scholars to date these fragments with any high degree of certainty. There also exists a collection of Cyril's homilies on the gospel according to Luke, known as the *Commentary on Luke.* These homilies are extant in Syriac, Armenian, and Arabic translations.[31] The homilies on the gospel according to Luke were probably written after the Nestorian crisis given that they contain references to that crisis.[32]

---

[27] Throughout the *Commentary on John* Cyril often refers to the unity of Christ in terms of mixture and interweaving. For a good example of this see Cyril remarks on John 17:4-5, Bk. 11, Ch. 6; (tr. Pusey, v.2 ,491; *In Joannem* v.2, 671-672)

[28] Cyril refers to the sixth dialogue on the Trinity in his first letter to Nestorius. There Cyril says that it was written while Atticus of Constantinople was still alive and still not yet published (429). Atticus died in 425. See *Acta Concilliorum Oecumenicorum,* ed E.Schwartz, (Berlin, 1924) 1, 1, 1, 24, 29f. (Hereafter cited as A.C.O.). For an English translation see *The Letters of St. Cyril of Alexandria,* tr. John McEnerney, Fathers of the Church, v.70, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1985) 35-36.

[29] Cyril, *Dialogues sur la Trinité,* ed. Georges M. de Durand, Sources chrétiennes, vv.231, 237, 246., (Paris: Editions du Cerf).

[30] Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche, Texte und Untersuchungen,* v.61, (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957) 153-269. Reuss argues that this commentary was written before the Nestorian controversy. There is nothing in the *Commentary on Matthew* that refers to the Nestorian crisis and Reuss dates this commentary sometime before 429 but after the *Commentary on John.*

[31] On this see M. Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum,* v.3, (Turnhout: Brepolis, 1979) 5-7. In 1859 R. Payne Smith published and an English translation of the Syriac version entitled *A Commentary upon the Gospel according to S. Luke, by S. Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria,* vv.2, (Oxford, 1859). This translation was reprinted in 1983 by Studion Press. The Clavis lists only three extant homilies from the Greek version of the *Commentary on Luke* which can be attributed with a high degree of certainty to Cyril.

[32] See J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche, Texte und Untersuchungen,* v.61, (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957) XXXVII.

Without a doubt, and regardless of the dates of other New Testament commentaries, the *Commentary on John* is the most intact of Cyril's New Testament commentaries written before the Nestorian controversy. Thus I am justified in studying this commentary in order to explore the mature Christology of Cyril's exegesis before the Nestorian controversy.

C) Cyril's Fundamental Theological Presuppostions and Exegetical Principles

Before I proceed any further it is necessary to identify some of the key principles that inform Cyril's exegetical method. My discussion of this subject further down is deliberately brief; it is beyond the scope of this study to provide a detailed analysis of Cyril's exegetical method.

The whole question of how to approach the exegesis of the Fathers of the Church is still a matter of some dispute today in modern scholarship. Lars Koen, in his study of Cyril's Christology and soteriology, has argued against an approach which claims that the Fathers misinterpreted the scriptures and that their "exegesis" is not exegesis but "eisegesis." Koen claims that this approach, common among scholars in search of "Frühkatholizismus", is mistaken because it overlooks the fact that exegesis and theology were inseparable in the mind of the Fathers and that the Fathers took for granted that the scriptures were the source of their theological beliefs as articulated in the creeds and rules of faith.[33] Secondly, Koen criticizes those theologians who have approached the exegesis of the Fathers in terms solely of their method be it typological or allegorical.[34] This approach also fails in the final analysis to take into account the fact that doctrinal

---

[33] Koen, "Saving Passion" 30. Koen identifies the following scholars as belonging to this school of thought: E. Aleith, *Paulusverständnis im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert,* (Berlin, 1937); T. Aono, *Die entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedankens bei den apostolischen Vätern,* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1979); K. Beyschalag, *Clemens Romanus und der Fruhkatholizismus,* (Tubingen, 1966); O. Knoch, *Eigenart und Beudeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss der ersten Clemensbriefs,* (Bonn, 1964); A. Lindemann, *Paulus im altesten Christentum,* (Tubingen, 1979); T. Torrance, *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers,* (London, 1948) Koen notices that Torrance has since moderated his views.

[34] Koen, "Saving Passion", 31. Oddly, Koen cites Alexander Kerrigan, R.P.C. Hanson, Jean Daniélou, and Henri de Lubac as exponents of this approach. But all of these scholars, especially de Lubac, are keenly aware of the importance of the theological suppositions which inform patristic exegesis.

principles informed both Fathers' exegetical methods and their application of these methods. Koen indicates his agreement with Frances Young, who has argued that scholarship has paid little attention to the use of the scriptures in doctrinal controversies and too much attention to the methods used in the Fathers' exposition of the scriptures.[35] To the observations of Koen and Young, I would add that an approach which dismisses the Fathers' interpretation of scripture as "eisegesis" assumes not only that there is only one meaning to be found in the sacred text but also that there can be a neutral reading of the text. From the point of view of modern hermeneutics this position is on very shaky ground. To fully enter this question is beyond the scope of this study. All I can do here is note the difficulty involved in such an approach and state that it is not an assumption of this work.

Rowan Greer has reminded scholars that the theological principles of the Fathers not only gave shape to their exegesis but largely determined the very questions that the Fathers put to the texts.[36] Any investigation of Cyril's exegesis must take into account the theological presuppositions which animate his exegesis. If these presuppositions are not kept in mind then Cyril's interpretation of the scriptures is liable to be misunderstood.

1) Cyril and the Relationship between the Old and New Testament.

For Cyril there exists a unity and harmony between the Old and New Testament. Both Testaments have to do with a two-fold covenant that is given by the same God. Thus there exists a unity between the two distinct stages of revelation.[37] These points are basic suppositions in Cyril's exegesis. Cyril knows of two senses of scripture: the literal (ἡ ιστορία) and the spiritual (ἡ θεωρία). The literal sense has to do with the facts which belong to history and are types and shadows that point to the mystery of Christ. The spiritual sense is the truth and reality

[35] Frances Young, "Exegetical Method and Scriptural Proof," *Studia Patristica*, ed. E. Livingstone, v. 19 (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1979).

[36] Rowan Greer, *The Captain of Our Salvation*, (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1973) 5.

[37] For an excellent analysis of Cyril's defense of the unity of the Old and New Testaments against the objections of the emperor Julian see William Malley's *Hellenism and Christianity*, (Rome: Gregorian University 1978) 342-365.

typified and signed by the literal sense. Moreover, the spiritual sense aims at uncovering the links between the Old and New Testaments.[38] The claim that Christians possess the interpretative key for unlocking the meaning of the Old Testament is a major concern of Cyril's exegesis.[39] As Alexander Kerrigan has shown, the key principle of Cyril's exegetical method is that the spiritual sense is the expression of the unity between the Old and New Testaments.[40] Furthermore, Kerrigan noticed that only those significations of scripture that are concerned with the mystery of Christ are understood by Cyril in a spiritual sense. This point is made in the *Glaphyra in Genesim:*

> the New Testament is sister to and closely related to the Mosaic oracles; indeed it is composed of the self-same elements. We can show that the life in Christ is not remote from conduct in accordance with the law provided that the ancient oracles are given a spiritual interpretation.[41]

---

[38] Cyril, *Glaphyra in Genesim*, Bk.1 (P.G. 69, 16A) Kerrigan notices that this spiritual sense is not in Cyril's eyes something uncovered in ordinary reflection. The discovery of it is only possible under the gift of illumination given by the Spirit. See *In Isaiam* Bk.3, Ch..1 (PG 70, 576A)

[39] It should be noted that recent research has shown that Cyril used the techniques and principles of the secular grammarians in his Old Testament exegesis. See J. David Cassell "Cyril of Alexandria and the Science of the Grammarians: A Study in the Setting, Purpose, and Emphasis in Cyril's *Commentary on Isaiah*," (Unpublished Ph.D, dissertation, University of Virginia, 1992). Cassell's fine study demonstrates how Cyril used the tools of the grammarians in his interpretation of the book of Isaiah: clarification and explanation of tropes, interpretation of the uncommon and rare words, the historical features of the text, etymology, analogy, and textual criticism. Cassell claims that Cyril's *Commentary on Isaiah* was originally a series of lectures given to the clergy of Alexandria in order to teach them how to read and interpret the biblical text. As bishop of Alexandria, Cyril no doubt would have taken great interest in making sure that his clergy possessed the skills necessary to perform their liturgical responsibilities. In order to carry these responsibilities the clergy had to be able to read, interpret the scriptures. The education of most men who began training for the priesthood in fifth century Alexandria was probably not of a very high level unless they were of a wealthy, upper class family (see the fourth chapter of Cassell's dissertation). Cassell argues convincingly that Cyril, in his lectures that make up his Commentary on Isaiah, instructed the clergy in the techniques of the grammarians in order to supply them with some of the necessary tools needed to interpret the scriptures. Cyril, according to Cassell, used the bible instead of secular classical texts to teach his clergy how to read and interpret a text. Of course, Cyril combined the techniques of the grammarians with the traditional christological interpretation of the book of Isaiah.

[40] Alexander Kerrigan *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Interpreter of The Old Testament,* 136.

[41] Cyril, *Glaphyra in Genesim,* Bk.3 (P.G. 68 137A) as cited and translated in Kerrigan, *St. Cyril: Interpreter of the Old Testament,* 134. William Malley, *Hellenism and Christianity,* 364 has observed that for Cyril the unity between the law and the prophets and the gospel reveal more than simply the existence of a transcendental God and the creation of humanity in this God's image and likeness. Both Testaments in Cyril's eyes disclose the trinitarian dimension of the Godhead and that the love of this God who is three in one includes the salvific mission of Christ.

Cyril repeats this point again and again in his biblical commentaries. One favorite text of the Old Testament that Cyril uses to show that the old covenant points to Christ is Deut 18:15: "The Lord your God will raise up a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren - him you shall heed." Not surprisingly, Cyril identifies this prophet with Christ. In his comments upon John 5:46 ("If you believed Moses you would have believed me, for he wrote of me") Cyril cites the passage from Deuteronomy to show that the Mosaic writings foreshadowed Christ.[42] He argues that the mediation of Moses[43] was given by God as a "medicine of infirmity" for the Jews and that the decrees of God were mediated to the synagogue. But now one must "transfer again the type to the truth and will hereby think of Christ, mediator of God and men, ministering to the more teachable by means of a human voice (when for oursakes he was born of a woman) the ineffable will of God the Father ..."[44]

For Cyril then there is agreement between the law and the prophets and Christ. In his comments on the account of the transfiguration in Luke he writes that Moses and Elijah who stood before Christ represented the fact that Christ had the law and the prophets as his bodyguard. But Christ is also the end of the law and prophets according to Cyril and that is why Christ said to the Jews that Moses wrote of him.[45] This point is summed up in a passage in the *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate:*

> But he [Christ] is the fullness of the law and the prophets, I think, since every prophetic oracle looks toward him ... Accordingly he says he has come not todestroy the law, but rather to perfect it, do not think that a complete overthrow of the ancient oracles has been accomplished but rather a transformation or, if I may say so, a molding of what were types into the truth.[46]

This theme of transformation of types touches upon a key exegetical and theological principle of Cyril's exegesis. The work of R. Wilken[47] has shown that

[42] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.3, Ch.3 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 307-308)

[43] The Spanish scholar Luis Armendariz has pointed out that idea of Christ as a new Moses is key theme in Cyril's *De Adoratione* and in the *Glaphyra in Genesim*. See L. Armendariz *El Nuevo Moises. Dinámica christocéntrica en la tiplogica de Cirilo Alejandrino,* (Madrid, 1962).

[44] Ibid.

[45] Cyril, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke,*trans. R. Payne Smith (2nd edition., New York: Studion, 1983) Hom. 51, 227-228.

[46] Cyril, *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate,* Bk.1 (PG 68, 140B-C) as cited and translated in Kerrigan, *St.Cyril: Interpreter of the Old Testament* 137, n.3.

[47] Wilken, *Judaism And The Early Christian Mind,* 69-92.

this is the central idea that Cyril brings to the solution of the problem of the relationship between the two Testaments. Wilken argues that this idea is suggested in a number of Cyril's interpretations of biblical texts, most notably John 4:24, "God is Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth." Wilken claims that this text supplied Cyril in his Old Testament exegesis with an "overarching framework" to discuss the relationship between the two Testaments.[48] The Alexandrian bishop took this passage to mean that worship in spirit and truth marks both the end and the fulfillment of Judaism and Jewish worship. Wilken points to a homily in which Cyril forcefully expresses this conviction in an anti-Jewish polemic:

> When will you join in with service in spirit to God, the king of all things? "God is a spirit and those who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." For you have neglected to serve in the spirit and, more than that, you have chosen the more inferior sacrifice as the most pleasing to yourselves. In the arrogant obtuseness of the letter of the law, you still think that you can honor God through this, and you shake off the more accurate perception of the law as if you had entire knowledge of what was written ....[49]

Wilken notices that Cyril's interpretation of John 4:24 presupposes that Christianity is the outcome of the transformation of Judaism into a new way of life marked by worship in spirit and truth. But it should be added here to Wilken's observation that for Cyril the symbols and types of the old covenant find their meaning and norm in the sacrifice of Christ.[50] This emphasis is clear in his comments upon John 19:30 which will be examined below. Here, it is sufficient to note this point.

---

[48] Ibid, 92

[49] Cyril, *Homilia Paschalis,* VI, (PG 77, 513d-516b) as cited and translated in Wilken, *Judaism And The Early Christian Mind,* 74-75. Cyril repeats this theme often see the citations by Wilken, *Judaism And The Early Christian Mind,* 76.

[50] Malley, *Hellenism and Christianity,* 364-365 has noticed that Cyril's concept of symbol is functional i.e. as the plan of salvation history develops, symbols can be transformed into something new. Thus "the symbol can become obsolete once the truth is learned and the plan of salvation progresses. This is exactly what happened with the coming of Christ. In one sense, there was something new, and in another, the same truth was being taught." The point that Malley goes on to make is that Cyril's concept of symbol is based upon the idea that God is a God of history. This concept ran directly counter to the Hellenism of Julian, which considered the permanence of a divine symbol to be essential if it was to reveal the divine. But this notion of symbol, in contrast to Cyril's, is based upon the idea that the immutable God cannot be within mutable history but must be a God which discloses itself through nature and cult.

While Christians do not worship in the old way, Cyril is still concerned to show that the law has not been abolished. Kerrigan[51] pointed out that in *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate* Cyril recognizes some passages of scripture appear to say that the law has been abolished: e.g. John 4:21-24, Gal 5:47, Heb 7:18f, 8:7-10,13.[52] Specifically, Kerrigan called attention to the fact that Cyril attempted to reconcile these passages with Matt 5:17 which appears to say that the law is still in force.[53] The Alexandrian bishop came to three conclusions about this problem: 1) it is an error to think that the law has been abrogated to the extent that none of its prescriptions are binding; 2) it is also an error to think that the law is useless; 3) Lastly, it is mistaken to think that the Law cannot be utilized as proof for the truth.[54] Cyril then gives three reasons in support of these conclusions and in doing so also shows how the spiritual sense expresses the harmony of the Old and New Testaments. Firstly, the law is a type and shadow and has the beauty of truth hidden inside of it.[55] Secondly, the law is pedagogical and leads to the mystery of Christ. Thirdly, the very first of God's words are contained in the law.[56]

Given that Cyril comes to these conclusions, it follows in Kerrigan's estimation, that the Alexandrian bishop's understanding of the spiritual sense of scripture relies mainly upon biblical foundations. But it also must be realized, as Henri de Lubac[57] has pointed out, that when the Fathers read scripture they were not simply giving commentary but were also interpreting history. The same can be said of Cyril. For him, as for all of the Fathers, the mystery of Christ and his church is fulfilled and accomplished historically.[58] Scripture, which records all of salvation history, is interpreted in the light of the sacrifice of Christ.[59] De Lubac has also

---

[51] Kerrigan, *St. Cyril: Interpreter of the Old Testament,* 136.

[52] *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate,* Bk.1 (PG 68, 133B ff)

[53] Ibid., (P.G. 68, 137)

[54] Ibid., (P.G. 68, 140A)

[55] IIbid., (P.G. 68, 137B)

[56] Ibid., (P.G. 68, 140)

[57] Henri de Lubac, *Catholicism,* trans. Sr. Elizabeth Englund. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988) 170.

[58] In fact in his *Catholicism,* at 170 n.17 de Lubac specifically cites Cyril in this regard, *Glaphyra in Genesim.* Bk.1 (P.G. 69, 14-15). There Cyril refers to the *anakephalaiosis* that is given in Christ. We will see that this headship for Cyril always refers to the Headship of the second Adam in relation to his body, the Church.

[59] de Lubac, *Catholicism,* 179-180.

shown that in the ancient Church there existed the fundamental conviction and category of the discontinuity and continuity of the Old and New Testament. While both are dispensations of salvation and thus are two distinct sacramental institutions, in their unity, they comprise one economy and one history of salvation.[60] For the ancient Church the new covenant fulfills the old covenant by the very fact that it transforms it. These ideas are fully present in the thought of Cyril. I will return to these ideas later. At this point it is sufficient to note them.

2) Basic Christological Principles in Cyril's New Testament Exegesis

Kerrigan noticed[61] that in Cyril's exegesis of the New Testament the words and deeds of Christ are clarified by three sets of expressions:

> a) expressions referring to his divine attributes (φωναί θεοπρεπεις), b) expressions describing his human traits (φωναί ἀνθρωποπρεπεις), c) go-between (φωναὶ μέσαι) or "mixed" (κεκραμέναι) expressions which refer to both the humanity and divinity of Christ.[62]

This latter set of expressions have to do with Cyril's affirmation of the communication of idioms. For example, in his comments on John 4:6 Cyril says that "himself [the Logos], the strength of all, is said to be wearied" because he became flesh. The Alexandrian patriarch urges his interlocutor not to "divide the one Christ into a duality of sons, *even though he makes his own the sufferings of his humanity*" Throughout his interpretation of the New Testament Cyril is preoccupied with upholding the position that the words and deeds recorded in scripture about Christ refer to one subject: the Word who is made flesh. Whatever Christ said or did must be attributed either to his capacity as God or to his capacity as man. But these attributions are always predicated of one and the same Christ.[63]

---

[60] de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum,* (Paris: Aubier, 1948) 72 ff.

[61] Alexander Kerrigan,"The Objects of the Literal and Spiritual Sense of the New Testament" *Studia Patristica, Texte und Untersuchungen,* v.43, (Berlin: Verlag Akademie, 1957) 354-374.

[62] Alexander Kerrigan, "The Objects of the Literal and Spiritual Senses of the New Testament according to Cyril of Alexandria," in *Studia Patristica, Texte und Unterschungen,* v. 43, 358. With regard to the "mixed" expressions Kerrigan points Cyril's comments on John 5:19 in the Commentary on John (Bk.2 Ch..6; *In Joannem,* v.1, 367; tr. Pusey ,v.1 252) and the comments on John 5:30 (*In Joannem,* v.1 324; tr. Pusey, v.1, 350). Cyril speaks of "go-between" expressions in his comments on Hebrews 12:8 in *Epistolam ad Hebraeos,* (*In Joannem,* v.3 417). Koen, "Saving Passion", refers to these distinctions as "partitive exegesis" in contrast to Maurice Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel,* who speaks of Cyril's two-nature exegesis.

The unity of Christ is a basic supposition of Cyril's exegesis and he delights in pointing how the Son endured the limits of the flesh. One thing that has escaped the attention of Kerrigan is that for Cyril Christ as the second Adam transcends the first Adam. In his commentary upon scripture Cyril is at times almost preoccupied with contrasting the first Adam and the second Adam. Cyril's understanding of unity between the Old and New Testaments, his distinction between a literal and spiritual sense of scripture and his conviction that the mystery of Christ, the second Adam, is foreshadowed and fulfilled historically, constitute the over-arching framework of the Christology of his biblical commentaries.

D) The Christ of Cyril's Biblical Commentaries: The Research of Robert Wilken

I have already mentioned the importance of the work of R. Wilken. He approached Cyril not simply as a dogmatic theologian but also as a biblical theologian and argued that the importance of the exegesis of the Fathers for the history of dogma has not been sufficiently appreciated by scholars. Wilken has called attention to the need for research into the images and themes of Cyril's exegesis in regard to the Alexandrian's Christology. He noted in his doctoral dissertation that this work had barely begun and argued that the Christology of Cyril as found in his exegesis must not be read through the eyes of later Christological questions.[64]

Wilken, who did not consider his work exhaustive, discovered the importance of the motif of the second Adam in Cyril's exegesis.[65] In Wilken's eyes it allowed Cyril to explain how Christ was unique and enabled him to speak of Christ as both God and man. Wilken noticed that this typology is not used univocally. The Alexandrian uses the Adamic typology to express the unity of a number of related ideas. Cyril found it useful to express the idea that Christ was one with all humanity. He also used the Adamic typology to give expression to the conviction that Christ was the new beginning and the first fruits of the new creation, and in this context Cyril used the Adamic typology to show that Christ was unique and was capable of attaining that which ordinary men were not capable of attaining.

---

[63] Ibid., 378.

[64] Wilken, "Homo Futurus," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964) 10.

[65] Wilken, "Homo Futurus," and especially his book *Judaism And The Early Christian Mind,*

Wilken argued that the Adamic typology validates the exegetical claim that Christ the second Adam fulfills the types of the Old Testament. The shadows of the Old Testament come to their full clarity of the light and truth in Christ.

Wilken also discovered that the image of Christ as high priest who offered the spotless sacrifice is another important motif in Cyril's exegesis. The biblical images of the two Adams and Christ the high priest, Wilken argued, are witnesses to the unity between faith and scripture. He also correctly pointed out that in the biblical commentaries of Cyril, Christ is the savior not simply because of who he is but also because of what he does. For Cyril, the glory of Christ is most positively revealed in his death on the cross.[66] Wilken came to the conclusion that Cyril's exegesis is rooted in the confession of the *Logos sarx egeneto.* Thus exegesis and theology are integrated in the thought of Cyril as they both find their source in this confession.[67]

Wilken's research is an important beginning for a re-accessment of Cyril's Christology. He shows convincingly that it is not enough to look only at Cyril's dogmatic works in order to understand Cyril Christology. Wilken's work also shows the importance of the Adamic typology for Cyril's Christology and his research demonstrates that the description of Cyril's Christology as a Logos-sarx one is not helpful. While Wilken's work is an important entry into the research of Cyril's understanding of Christ it did not purport to be the final word. Wilken's insights provide only a partial picture of the Christ of Cyril's biblical commentaries. Further research shows that Cyril's emphasis upon the Christ as the second Adam and as the high priest who offers a spotless sacrifice is made within the historical context of the Logos stooping down and emptying himself out. In other words, Cyril firmly situated the motifs of the second Adam in a kenotic context. The second Adam is the Son who emptied himself for our sakes. The kenosis in turn is linked with the unity of the second Adam: the eternal Son who emptied himself proved himself to be the second Adam. Thus the themes of the kenosis and the second Adam can be said to condition one another. The classic text on the kenosis for Cyril is Phil 2: 5-9, which functions as Cyril's canon within the canon. He cites this text at least 26 times in the *Commentary on John.*[68] Cyril's emphasis

[66] Wilken, "Homo Futurus," 110.

[67] Ibid., 147

[68] Koen has recognized the importance of this text for Cyril's entire corpus. He argues that Cyril

upon this text does not enter into Wilken's analysis. Another important text that Cyril often cites together with the Philippians text is 2 Cor 8:9 ("Rich, for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty we might be rich".)

The kenosis and the Adamic typology are inseparable in Cyril's exegesis. It will be shown that for Cyril the sacrifice offered by the second Adam is the apex of the kenosis and hence the high point of the incarnation. This idea reaches its high point in Cyril's comments upon John 19:30. This passage in the *Commentary on John* is one of the most important in the entire commentary. There Cyril explains that at the death of Christ the divine mysteries are fully revealed. It is also clear from this passage that scripture is interpreted by Cyril in the light of this sacrifice. Before we can explore any of this, however, it is necessary to situate this study within the history of research on Cyril's thought. It is to a brief review of this history that we must now turn.

uses Phil 2: 5-11 and John 1:14 as proof texts for his incarnational and soteriological theology. Both texts constitute what Koen calls the loci of Cyril's Christology and soteriology.

Chapter One: History of Research: Cyril and his Interpreters

In the late nineteenth century the most influential interpreter of Cyril of Alexandria was without a doubt the German historian of dogma and patristic theology, Adolf von Harnack.[1] Harnack's method of studying the thought of Cyril as well as his presentation of Cyril's thought set the tone for later scholarly research. Harnack interpreted Cyril upon the supposition that patristic theology was first and foremost dogmatic theology - the work of the Greek spirit on the soil of the Gospel. This supposition of Harnack's liberal Protestantism completely governed his interpretation of Cyril. The German historian limited his study to the patriarch's polemical and dogmatic works and completely ignored the commentaries on scripture. He argued that Cyril was a thinker with little genuine theological interest save for a few set formulas. In Harnack's eyes Cyril's theological interest was so negligible that a monograph on his thought would be worthless.

Harnack located Cyril in a period of the history of dogma where the Church doctrine was, in his estimation, moving farther and farther away from the Christ of the Gospels. He was convinced that Greek thinkers, like Cyril, were unable to square the Christ of faith with the Christ of the Gospels because "the physical unity of the two natures and the interchange of properties, which Cyril had worked out in strict fashion, swallowed up what of the human remained in him".[2]

---

[1] Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, tr. Neil Buchanan, v.6, (New York: Russell and Russell, 1961) 174-179.

Harnack presented Cyril as a thinker who thought that everything depended upon the fact that in Christ a hypostatic union was achieved in which human nature was purified and transfigured.

Cyril, according to Harnack, did manage to vindicate "Greek piety", which held that if the Logos did not suffer humanly he did not save humanity divinely. Moreover, Harnack thought that for Cyril the starting point of Christian faith is not the historical Christ but the Logos and that the Alexndrian patriarch "is occupied only with him."[3] While Harnack contended that the best of what Cyril had he usually got from Apollinarius, he recognized that unlike Apollinarius Cyril ascribed a full humanity to Christ.[4] The German historian also argued that the bishop of Alexandria spelled out his faith only in a polemical form and what was really characteristic of his Christology was his denial that an individual man was present in Christ.[5] Furthermore, Harnack recognized that Cyril appealed to the eucharist in support of the incarnation and vice vera. But according to Harnack, Cyril's understanding of the eucharist was minimal at best and he did not teach that "the real body of Christ is present in the eucharistic body; it is rather only an operative presence that is meant; the eucharistic body is identical in its effects with the real."[6] Cyril's understanding of the eucharist was reduced to what Harnack believed was the patriarch's understanding of the mode of Christ's presence as it was expressed in his dogmatic works.

In 1905 there appeared Eduard Weigl's *Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien.*[7] Unlike Harnack, Weigl looked to Cyril's biblical commentaries, including the *Commentary on John,* as sources for Cyril's thought. Portions of Weigl's research must be approached with some caution as he often quotes from fragments of Cyril's works taken from the catenae without a concern for their authenticity. Weigl's book tried to describe and summarize, in very broad strokes, Cyril's understanding of the prelapsarian state, the fall of Adam, the divine plan to

---

[2] Ibid., 179.

[3] Ibid., 175.

[4] Ibid., 178, n.2.

[5] Ibid., 176.

[6] Ibid., 300.

[7] Eduard Weigl, *Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien,* "Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte," v.5 (Mainz, 1905). I have been unable to consult A. Rehrmann, *Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien,* Hildesheim, 1902.

restore and return humanity to its state before the fall, as well Cyril's doctrine of grace. A description of the Alexandrian bishop's *gnadelehre* makes up at least two-thirds of Weigl's work which concludes with a summary of Cyril's eschatology.

Weigl identified some of Cyril's most important soteriological themes: Christ as the second Adam; Christ as mediator between God and humanity as well as an emphasis upon recapitulation. On the other hand, Weigl conceived of Cyril's understanding of redemption primarily in terms of a "physical soteriology" whereby physical contact and participation in the enfleshed Logos expels corruption and communicates immortality. Weigl was certainly right to point out this soteriological theme in Cyril's thought. On the other hand, Cyril's soteriology cannot be completely identified with this emphasis. Weigl's work therefore does not adequately describe Cyril's soteriology as it is found in the *Commentary on John.* The value of Weigl's research for today's scholarship is also limited by the fact that Cyril's thought is often described in the language and categories of neo-scholasticism - categories that are, of course, alien to the thought of Cyril.

The early 1900's also saw Adolf Struckmann's *Die Eucharistielehre des heiligen Cyrill von Alexandrien.*[8] Struckmann, a Catholic, wrote in reply to several Protestant scholars[9] who had advanced the thesis that Cyril taught a spiritual and non-corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist. His research tried to show

---

[8] Adolf Struckmann, *Die Eucharistielehre des heiligen Cyrill von Alexandrien*, (Paderborn, 1910). I should mention here Martin Jugie's "La terminology christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Echoes d'Orient,* 15 (1912): 12-27. Jugie did not directly reply to Harnack but noted that lack of uniformity in Cyril's Christological terminology.

[9] Struckmann replied to the articles of E. Michaud "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'eucharistie," *International de théologie,* 10 (1902): 599-614; E. Steitz, "Die Abendmahlslehre der Kirche", *Jahrebücher für deutsche Theologie,* 12 (1867): 235-245. The Catholic scholar J. Mahé also replied to Harnack, Michaud and Steitz in his "L'eucharistie d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue d' histoire ecclésiastique,* 8 (1907): 677-696. Mahé's article is probably the most valuable work from this controversy. There is more of a theological analysis of Cyril's understanding of the eucharist in Mahé's article than in Struckmann's monograph. Mahé's study, however, is primarily limited to showing that Cyril taught that the bread and wine offered in the eucharist were changed into the body and blood of Christ. Mahé further concluded that Cyril's Christology governed his theology of the eucharist. He also wrote an article in 1909 analyzing Cyril's understanding of grace and sanctification: "La sanctification d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 8 (1909): 30-40. Mahé came to the conclusion that Cyril taught that there existed in the souls of the just a sanctifying grace but that this grace was not a sort of instrumental quality disconnected from the Spirit but rather the "infusion" and action of the Spirit in the souls of the just.

that Cyril taught that the bread and wine offered in the eucharist was converted into the body and blood of Christ and that consequently Cyril taught that Christ's presence in the eucharist was a substantial and corporeal presence. There is very little sustained theological analysis of Cyril's theology of worship and eucharist in Struckmann's work. He collected texts from Cyril's works, including the biblical commentaries, that explicitly refer to the eucharist and quoted them against his Protestant adversaries.

In 1940 R.V. Sellers published his *Two Ancient Christologies*[10] which contained an important section on Cyril. Sellers' short presentation of Cyril's Christology, a section of some twenty-five pages, studied that Christology from the perspective of the dogmatic works and the biblical commentaries, especially the *Commentary on John.* The British scholar presented Cyril's Christology as kenotic Christology where Christ is a "theandric person whose activity is also theandric."[11] Sellers contended that on the one hand Cyril understood the Logos as having submitted to the "earthly conditions, and the manhood, possessing the power of self-determination."[12] On the other hand, Sellers argued that, for Cyril, the laws of the earthly condition excluded the intellectual and moral sphere. He pointed to passages in Cyril's works where the patriarch had difficulty in interpreting Christ's growth in wisdom and the ignorance of Christ. Sellers argued that this "flaw" was understandable because Cyril was "brought up in the Platonic tradition" and tended to put emphasis upon the abstract rather than the concrete.[13]

The intimation in all this was that Cyril's Christology had no real role for the soul of Christ. It is certainly true, as Thomas Torrance would later put it, that Cyril did not fully think out what would later be called the *enhypostatic* aspects of the incarnation. Cyril's concept of Christ as high priest, which Sellers did not examine, shows the crucial place that the soul of Christ occupied in Cyril's Christology. Sellers' research, which suggested that Cyril's biblical commentaries were an important source for further research into his Christology, was not given the attention it deserved from scholars writing in the 1940's and 1950's.

---

[10] R.V. Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies* (London, 1940) 81-106.

[11] Ibid., 95.

[12] Ibid., 105.

[13] Ibid., Sellers offered no evidence for his claim that Cyril was brought up in the Platonic tradition. Cyril's *Commentary on John* shows that he was primarily interested in the life of the historical and concrete Christ.

The tendency to study Cyril primarily from the perspective of his dogmatic and polemical works continued in Herbert du Manior's *Dogme et Spirtualité chez Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie.*[14] The book not only explores Cyril's Christology but also his eucharistic theology, ecclesiology, mariology, and theology of the spiritual life. The book has some useful material but it supposes that Cyril wrote first and foremost as a dogmatic theologian. Du Manior studied Cyril's Christology chiefly from the perspective of the dogmatic writings and does not examine to any great extent the Christology of Cyril as it is found in his biblical commentaries. The sections on Cyril's eucharistic theology are nevertheless valuable and it is obvious that du Manior consulted the Commentary on John in this regard. Nevertheless, Du Manior did not examine the relationship between Cyril's Christology and eucharistic theology at any real length especially as it is found in Cyril's *Commentary on John.* Nor did du Manior explore Cyril's profound understanding of Christ as high priest, which is at the very heart of Cyril's understanding of Christian worship.

The 1950s saw several important studies of Cyril's Christology. The first of these studies was Jacques Liébaert's *La Doctrine Christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle Nestorienne.*[15]The French scholar examined the

[14] Herbert du Manior, *Dogme et Spiritualité chez Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie,* (Paris, 1944) Here I should also note Eduard Schwartz's "Cyrill und der Mönch Victor," *Weiner Akademie-Sitzungsberichte,* v.204 (Wein, 1928). Schwartz presented Cyril as a man who was more of a ruthless politician than a bishop with genuine theological interests. In 1938 an article appeared by L. Janssens "Notre filiation divine d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses,* 15 (1938): 233-278. Janssens explored Cyril"s concept of adoptive sonship in Christ and noticed Cyril's theology of recapitulation but argued that there was no adoptive sonship at creation or before the fall. I have been unable to consult J. van den Dries' dissertation "The Formula of Saint Cyril of Alexandria,." (Ph.D. dissertation, Gregorian University, 1939) In 1947 there appeared a tripartite article by Dominic Unger: "Christ Jesus the Secure Foundation according to Cyril of Alexandria," *Franciscan Studies* 7 (1947): 1-25; 324-343; 399-414. Unger argued that for Cyril the coming of Christ did not depend upon the fall and that Cyril taught that Christ was the secure foundation of creation. Unger noticed some important elements in Cyril's theology but he imagined Cyril to be a more consistent thinker than he actually was.

[15] Jacques Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle Nestorienne,* Lille, 1951). See also his "Christologie: Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon (451)," *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* eds., M. Schmaus und Alois Grillmeier, v.3, pt.1a, (Freiburg: Herder, 1965) 105f. There Liébaert noted that a real knowledge of the Christology of Cyril's early works had yet to be attained. "L'evolution de la Christologie de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie a partir de la controverse Nestorienne,", *Mélange de science religieuse,* 27 (Avril 1970): 27-48. There Liébaert compares and contrasts Cyril with Nestorius and also tries to show that Cyril's thought has a deeper appreciation for the humanity of Christ. Liébaert traces the

Christology of Cyril's writings penned before 428. There are numerous references in Liébaert's work to Cyril's biblical commentaries and to the *Commentary on John* but the Christology of these commentaries does not inform Liébaert's analysis of Cyril's early Christology.[16] Cyril is still studied there as though he wrote primarily as a dogmatic theologian. Liébaert devoted most of his attention to the dogmatic works, most notably the anti-"Arian" *Thesaurus*. Liébaert was able to show that large parts of Cyril's *Thesaurus* repeated sizable portions of Athanasius' *Contra Arianos*. He contended that: "La christologie de saint Cyrille Alexandrie telle que la révelènt ses écrits antérieurs à 428 se présent comme un système bien caractérisé et très cohérent."[17]

According to Liébaert Cyril's writings before 428 barely advanced beyond the thought of Athanasius. Cyril, in maintaining that Christ was one with his flesh, closely followed Athanasius. Liébaert argued that when Cyril wanted to emphasize that the incarnate Logos is always the subject of attribution, he repeatedly returned to the formulas of Athanasius[18] Thus Liébaert classified Cyril's Christology under a Logos-sarx framework. While Liébaert thought that Cyril was aware of the theological progress achieved before his ascension to the patriarchal chair he argued that Cyril was unable to integrate this progress into his theology.[19]

Liébaert assumed that Cyril understood *sarx* to mean unanimated corporeality and was evidently unaware of Cyril's numerous assertions wherein he indicates that he understands *sarx* as representing fallen human nature in its entirety. Consequently Liébaert came to the conclusion that the Alexandrian Patriarch did not predicate suffering to the soul of Christ but only to the "flesh". He admitted that for Cyril the sufferings of Christ were sensed by a spiritual principle but that Cyril never explains the nature of this principle.[20] Liébaert contended that Cyril ignored the soul and the human psychology of Christ in his arguments with the "Arians".

---

use of *prosopon* in Cyril's thought in "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'unique prosopon du Christ aux origines de la controverse nestorienne," *Melanges de Science Religieuse,* 34 (1977): 49-61.

[16] Later, Liébaert did call for scholars to study the Christology of Cyril's biblical commentaries. See J. Liébaert,"Christologie: Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon (451)," *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* eds., M. Schmaus und Alois Grillmeier, v.3, pt.1a, (Freiburg: Herder, 1965) 105.

[17] Ibid., 237.

[18] Ibid., 195f.

[19] Ibid., 157.

[20] Ibid., 172.

In Liébaert's view both Athanasius and Cyril were dependent upon and inspired by the anthropologies of their day. In the eyes of Liébaert, Cyril based his Christology upon an anthropology which understood man as a union not of body and soul but, of spirit and flesh. A Christology based on this sort of anthropology, which Liébaert thought was a form of neo-Platonism, could not find room for the soul of Christ except for a purely nominal assertion of its reality.[21] In the end Liébaert argued that Cyril subordinated redemption to the mediation of Christ. He thought that, for Cyril, the Son became incarnate for the purpose of being the mediator between God and humanity. Thus it was as mediator that Christ reconciled God and human creatures: i.e. by reconciling humanity and divinity in his person.[22]

In 1951 Henry Chadwick wrote an article entitled "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy".[23] Chadwick argued against those who considered Cyril to have been little more than a crafty and ruthless politician. He pointed out that what troubled Cyril most about Christological dualism was its soteriological implications and hence it implications for the eucharist. Chadwick recognized the importance of Cyril's *Commentary on John* for Cyril's Christology and theology of the eucharist, and even claimed that an adequate account of Cyril's Christology could be derived from this commentary.[24] Nevertheless he did not explore the Christology of the *Commentary on John.*

Chadwick observed that the eucharist was at the very center of Cyril's thought and piety and that the Antiochene Christology with its unsatisfactory concept of the unity of Christ denied the very center of Cyril's theology. Cyril was presented by Chadwick as teaching that every eucharist was a re-incarnation of the Logos and the eucharistic body mediated salvation to believers. The Oxford professor argued, chiefly on the basis of Cyril's dogmatic works, especially the *Scholia de incarnatione unigeniti,* that Cyril's Christology had nothing to say

[21] Ibid., 154-158. In the conclusion to his monograph at p.239 Liébaert writes in regard to Cyril's anthropology: "S 'inspirant d'une anthropologie courante à l' èpoque, cette christologie a étè celle d'hérétiques, tels Arius ou Apollinaire, comme aussi de théologiens orthodoxes d'Athanase à Cyrille."

[22] Ibid., 221f.

[23] Henry Chadwick,"Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy,"*Journal of Theological Studies,* 2 (n.s.) (1951): 145-161.

[24] Ibid., 152.

about the role of the soul of Christ.[25] Chadwick was certainly right to point to the eucharist as the heart of Cyril's theology. However his presentation of Cyril's understanding of the eucharist is not complete or entirely accurate chiefly because his research barely touched the *Commentary on John* where much of Cyril's eucharistic theology is to be found.

Alexander Kerrigan's *Cyril of Alexandria: Interpreter of the Old Testament,*[26] published in 1952, was the first monograph to study Cyril's exegetical method. Kerrigan showed that Cyril's method of interpreting the scriptures was a blend of Antiochene and Alexandrian elements and that Cyril's exegesis was to some extent dependent upon Jerome.[27] Like so many of the Fathers before and after him, Cyril distinguished between the literal and spiritual senses of scripture. But Kerrigan showed that Cyril did not over-allegorize as one might expect an Alexandrian to do. For Cyril the spiritual sense always has reference to Christ and without this reference there is no spiritual sense. Although Kerrigan's research was chiefly descriptive, it had the merit of shedding considerable light upon Cyril's exegetical method and his basic principles of exegesis.

In 1957 Dom Herman Diepen challenged Liébaert's presentation of Cyril's Christology.[28] Diepen also argued against the conclusions made in Georges

---

[25] Chadwick like Liébaert thought Cyril understood *sarx* to mean unanimated corporeality. More specifically Chadwick pointed to passages in the *Scholia* where Cyril says that the Logos "suffered impassibly." Chadwick intimates that Plotinus lurks behind this statement. See "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy", 159f. To be sure, Cyril predicated suffering to the incarnate Logos and the passages which Chadwick cited show that Cyril rans into trouble sometimes when he explained *how* the Logos suffered. These passages are not however indications that Cyril's Christology had nothing to say about the soul of Christ. On the contrary his understanding of Christ as high priest in the *Commentary on John* shows exactly the opposite.

[26] Alexander Kerrigan, *Cyril of Alexandria: Interpreter of the Old Testament,* (Rome: Pontifico Istituto Biblico, 1952). Also see Alexander Kerrigan,"The Objects of the Literal and Spiritual Sense of the New Testament," *Studia Patristica, Texte und Untersuchungen,* v.43, (Berlin: Verlag Akademie, 1957): 354-374.

[27] Ibid., 433f.

[28] Herman Diepen, *Aux origines de l'anthropologie de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie,* (Paris: Desclee de Brovwer, 1957). Also see his "La Christologie de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'anthropologie nèo-platonicienne." *Euntes Docete* 9 (1956): 20-63. I should mention here G. Langevin's "Le Theme de l'incorruptibilité dans in le commentaire de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie sur l"evangelie selon saint Jean," *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 8 (1956): 295-316. Langevin notices that for Cyril incorruptibility is communicated to the baptized through the eucharist. I should also note that in the early 1960's Augustin La Tour published two articles which examined Cyril's understanding of the glory of Christ. See his "La Doxa Du Christ Dans Saint Cyrille." *Recherches de science religeuse* 38 (1960): 520-42; "La Doxa Du Christ Dans Cyrille" 39 (1961): 69-94. His work did not

Jouassard's article "Un problèm d'anthropologie et de christologie chez saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie".[29] Against Liébaert, Diepen showed that Cyril did not base his Christology upon some form of neo-Platonist anthropology. He pointed out that the early Cyril repeatedly maintained that *sarx* referred to the full fallen humanity, body and soul. Moreover he observed that in the *Commentary On John* Cyril explicitly condemned the neo-Platonic idea that the body was a prison and punishment for the soul.[30] Diepen argued cogently that given Cyril's understanding of *sarx* Liébaert was mistaken to have concluded that Cyril never contested the "Arian" basis of Christology which reduced the Logos to the sphere of the soul. The source of Cyril's anthropology, according to Diepen was the scriptures and not neo-Platonism or Apollinarianism.[31]

Diepen was also sharply critical of Jouassard who had argued that the neo-Platonic concept of *apatheia* was a principle of Cyril's anthropology. Jouassard contended that Cyril thought the human soul, including the soul of Christ, to be impassible because the soul was incorporeal. He pointed to various passages in the works of Cyril where it is said that the soul does not participate in corporeal sufferings.[32] Against this presentation of Cyril, Diepen pointed not only to Cyril's clear Pauline understanding of *sarx* but also observed that the early Cyril explicitly attributed passions to the human soul and to the soul of Christ.[33] Diepen

---

examine the *Commentary On John* where Cyril's understanding of the glory of Christ underwent a development. I discuss La Tour's work later in the fourth chapter.

[29] Georges Jouassard, "Un problèm d'anthropologie et de christologie chez saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Recherches de science religieuse*, 43 (1955): 361-378.

[30] Diepen, *Aux origines de l'anthropologie de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie*, 28f.

[31] Ibid., 70f.

[32] Georges Jouassard, "Un problèm d'anthropologie et de christologie chez saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Recherches de science religieuse*, 43 (1955): 361f. On the same subject also see his "Impassibilité du Logos et impassibilité de l'âme humaine chez saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Recherches de science religieuse*, 45 (1957): 209-244. This article appeared the same year Diepen's book was published. I should also note here Jouassard's other articles. "Une intuition fondamentale de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie en christology dans les premiers années de son épiscopate," *Revue des études byzantines*, 10 (1953): 175-186. There Jouassard discusses what he calls Cyril's fundamental intuition: that the Son who is God by nature assumed a full humanity. "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et le schèma verbe-chair," *Recherches de science religieuse*, 44 (1956): 234-342. Jouassard points out in this article that the Christology of Cyril's early works does not always fit into the Logos-sarx schema. "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie aux prises avec la communication des idiomes avant 428 dans les ouvrages antiarians," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 81 (1962): 112-121. Jouassard observes in this article Cyril's early works do not always rigorously uphold the communication of idioms as do his later works.

admitted that Cyril thought that the soul did not suffer corporeal passions but this did not mean that he believed the soul was impassible. On the contrary, Diepen argued persuasively that Cyril made a distinction: the soul suffered the psychic passions of fear, sadness and agony. Thus Jouassard's argument that Cyril's anthropology was neo-Platonist was mistaken. Diepen's important research has not always received the scholarly attention it deserves.

In 1957 Walter Burghardt published his monograph, *The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria.*[34] Burghardt identified six facets in Cyril's concepts of the divine image: reason, dominion, sanctification, incorruptibility, and sonship. While Burghardt consulted Cyril's biblical commentaries it cannot be said that his presentation of Cyril's understanding of the divine image in man is primarily informed by Cyril's biblical commentaries including the *Commentary on John.* For this study, the pertinent aspects of Burghardt's research are those of his Christological and soteriological suppositions about Cyril's theology.

Burghardt recognized that the idea of recapitulation was central to Cyril's soteriology but he did not study the second Adam typology of Cyril's biblical commentaries at any length. He argued that for Cyril salvation is recapitulation but with an increase. The increase has to do with adoptive sonship in Christ which the first Adam did not enjoy, nor did he fall from it when he sinned.[35] I examine and discuss Burghardt's research in some detail in the fifth chapter this work.

Georges M. de Durand in 1964 provided new critical editions of Cyril's dogmatic Christological works: *De incarnatione unigenti* and *Quod unus sit Christus.*[36] Durand's introduction to these new critical editions amount to an

[33] Herman Diepen, *Aux origines de l'anthropologie de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie,* 50. I discuss the evidence Diepen cites in the second chapter.

[34] Walter Burghardt, *Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria,* (Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1957)

[35] Ibid., 115. Here Burghardt followed the view of L. Janssens, "Notre filiation divine d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses,* 15 (1938): 233-278.

[36] Georges M. de Durand, *Deux dialogues christologique,* Sources chrétiennes, v.97 (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1964). Durand dates *De incarnatione unigenti* shortly before the Nestorian controversy and *Quod unus sit Christus* after the controversy. Durand also edited a critical edition of Cyril's dialogues on the Trinity see *Dialogues sur la Trinité,* Sources chrétiennes, v. 231-232, 246 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1976) In 1964 there appeared Oliva Blanchette's article on Cyril's concept of the redemption: "Saint Cyril's Idea of the Redemption," *Sciences ecclesiastiques,* 19 (1964): 456-479. Blanchette argued that Cyril understood redemption as recapitulation and that Cyril distinguished two phases within recapitulation: juridical and mystical (salvation as deification). In the juridical phase Christ fulfilled the just requirements of the law and overcame sin in

important short monograph on Cyril's Christology. Although his presentation, for our purposes, is limited because it views Cyril's Christology almost solely from the perspective of the patriarch's dogmatic works, it still merits comments.

Durand points out that Cyril's thought is governed by the mystery of Christ and this mystery is the basis upon which Cyril synthesizes everything. The mystery of Christ, according to Durand, was the true starting point for Cyril's theology. He recognizes that Cyril frequently used the idea of kenosis to explicate the incarnation and points out that Cyril gives a definition of kenosis in *De incarnatione unigenti*: the assumption of flesh and the taking on of the form of a slave.[37] Durand acknowledges that Cyril understood *sarx* in the Pauline sense. Nevertheless, the French scholar does not fully integrate this recognition into his presentation of Cyril. In Durand's eyes, the early Cyril regarded the soul of Christ only as a physical factor and only later made Christ's soul a theological factor.[38] He wonders if the Nestorian crisis helped Cyril to sharpen his understanding of the soteriological significance of Christ's soul or whether the crisis arrested the development of his thought on this issue.[39] Durand claims that there are two basic movements in Cyril's thought.[40] In the first movement Cyril analyzes and explicates the mystery of Christ; in the second movement Cyril adores the mystery in silence and resists the temptation to say anything which would reduce it to mere human thought or language.

Durand argues that Cyril's soteriology serves to balance both movements. He points out rightly that in order to understand Cyril's Christology one must see it in the context of his soteriology. Cyril's Christology is never isolated from his soteriology. Durand contends that Cyril, influenced by Irenaeus of Lyons, saw salvation

---

the flesh. In dying Christ underwent the penalty that was upon us because of sin. But, according to Blanchette, Cyril did not think Christ paid the penalty for us; rather he transformed death into a means of returning to the Father. In the second phase of recapitulation "Christ saved us by returning to the Father as man." Thanks to the sacrifice of Christ humanity once again had access to God and could enjoy adoptive sonship.

[37] Ibid., 141, 332-334.

[38] Ibid., 112.

[39] Ibid., 112-113. Durand is well aware of the fact that in the *De incarnatione unigenti* and in letters to the Emperor and to the Princesses that Cyril assigns a soteriological role to the soul of Christ. My point here is that de Durand seems to think that when Cyril, in his early works, predicates suffering to the flesh of Christ that he speaks of flesh as mere corporeality.

[40] Ibid., 81f.

as essentially recapitulation.[41] At the same time Durand claims that, for Cyril, recapitulation gives humanity something in Christ that humanity did not have in Adam.[42] Durand acknowledges that Cyril claimed from time to time that Christ returns to humanity only what humanity had in the beginning, but, he argues that Cyril does not develop this line of thought.[43]

The importance of the eucharist for Cyril's thought does not escape the attention of Durand. He points out that for Cyril in the eucharist the baptized are made one body with Christ and come to share in his immortality.[44] Durand draws attention to Cyril's claim, made in the early work *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate,* that participation in the eucharist communicates sanctification, enables the baptized to persevere in virtue, and expels the corruption of sin.[45] Nevertheless, Durand does not make the argument that Cyril's Christology was directly dependent upon his understanding of the eucharist. Nor does he seem to be aware of the importance of Cyril's understanding of Christ as high priest for Cyril's Christology and theology of the eucharist. Finally, Durand argues that Cyril was capable of posing new problems for Christology but that he tried to answer those problems with old axioms. He thinks that Cyril had difficulty in responding to new circumstances in an original way. Durand tends to read Cyril primarily as a dogmatic theologian and appears to agree, for the most part, with those scholars who hold that Cyril's early Christology never went very far beyond Athanasius.

In 1964 Alois Grillmeier published the first volume of his *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche.*[46] The monograph was a full revsion of his article "Die theologische und sprachliche Vorbereitung der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon".[47] Grillmeier's magisterial work underwent another important revison in 1975. Both monographs appeared in English translations entitled *Christ in*

---

[41] Ibid., 90.

[42] Ibid., 90-91. Specifically Durand points to the fact that Cyril says that Christ, unlike Adam, will not lose the Spirit.

[43] Ibid., 91-92.

[44] Ibid., 96. Durand is also aware of Cyril's claim that the Spirit renews the souls of the baptized and makes them one in spirit.

[45] Ibid., 96. Durand cites *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate*, Ch.. 12 (P.G. 69, 793 BC).

[46] Alois Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche,* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1964)

[47] Alois Grillmeier and H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon,* (Wurzburg, 1951)

Christian Tradition.[48] Grillmeier's presentation of Cyril's early Christology, which closely follows the research of Liébaert, remains highly influential today. Grillmeier argues that the younger Cyril, i.e. the Cyril before the Nestorian crisis, appears to know nothing of the Christological controversies after Athanasius. Cyril's early Christology is described as an "archaic Logos-sarx" Christology. Grillmeier claims that the basic characteristics of the Christology of Cyril's early works, inclusive of the *Commentary On John,* are simply those of Athanasius. He maintains that while the early Cyril admitted the existence of the soul of Christ he never really considered it as a theological and soteriological factor.[49]

According to Grillmeier the early Cyril only attributes suffering to the flesh and not to the soul of Christ. He thinks that Cyril reads *sarx* as "body" and contends that the younger Cyril never thought to contest the basic Christological principle of the "Arians" which saw the Logos as taking the place of the soul of Christ.[50] For Grillmeier, Cyril only began to move beyond the Logos-sarx Christology during the Nestorian controversy. He argues that it was only in Cyril's writings of this period[51]that assigned suffering to soul of Christ and recognized the soul as a "theological factor".[52] In Grillmeier's estimation, Cyril only managed to supersede the Logos-sarx Christology in his second letter to Succensus. There Cyril recognizes that if Christ possessed a human soul then his humanity was a self moving principle - a nature. Grillmeier presents that Cyril's later Christology is a synthesis of the best elements of the Logos-sarx and Logos-anthropos Christologies.

In 1970 Robert Wilken published his *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology.* Wilken was the first scholar to investigate at some length the Christology of Cyril's biblical commentaries. He observes that Harnack's assumption that Cyril was primarily a dogmatic theologian and that the patriarch should only be studied as one, set the tone for

[48] Alois Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to the Council of Chalcedon (451)*, tr. John Bowden, (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1965); 2nd ed., (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975).

[49] Alois Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition.*, 414f.

[50] Ibid., 415-416.

[51] Grillmeier cites *Scholia de incarnatione unigenti,*(A.C.O, I, 5, I,219-231) *De recta fide ad Theodosium,* P.G. 76, 1133-1200 and *Oratio ad Pulcherium et Eudocuiam augustus de fide,* P.G. 76, 1336-1420.

[52] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition,* 475-76.

later scholarly research. Wilken's research of Cyril's exegesis arose partly from a dissatisfaction with the influence of Harnack's approach upon the study of Cyril as well as a dissatisfaction with the categories scholars traditionally used to describe Cyril's Christology, above all the Logos-sarx category.[53]

Wilken's work called into serious question the consensus that characterized Cyril's Christology as a Logos-sarx one. He argues that Cyril was not primarily a dogmatic theologian but first and foremost an interpreter of the bible. The real originality of Cyril as a theologian lies in his biblical commentaries. Wilken contends that Cyril's exegesis and his theology developed within the context of the problem between Judaism and Christianity. The continuation of Judaism was a theological problem for Cyril and his exegesis and theology developed in reference to this problem. A basic concern of much Cyril's exegesis was to show that Christians not only had a right to read the Old Testament but that Christianity read the Old Testament correctly in the light of Christ. Part of Wilken's fine study focuses on Cyril's use of the symbol of the second Adam in his biblical commentaries,[54] including the *Commentary On John*. For Cyril the second Adam typology highlighted the universal significance of Christ in salvation history. Wilken's research however did not inquire into the relationship between Cyril's understanding of Christ as the second Adam and his understanding of the eucharist.

Wilken did show that Cyril employed the second Adam typology to express and explicate the principle ideas of his Christology. Cyril used the second Adam to express the idea that Christ was truly man and that the future of all humanity was bound up with this man. At the same time Cyril employed the second Adam typology to express the idea that Christ was no ordinary man but was the Son of God who could do what ordinary men could not do - conquer death and bring about a new beginning and a new creation. Cyril closely links the second Adam

---

[53] I should note here the article of R.A. Norris which appeared in 1975 "Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria," *Studia Patristica,* v.13 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975): 255-268. Norris makes the point that the Logos-sarx category is not very useful for describing Cyril's Christology. He thinks Cyril used two Christological models: a subject attribute model and a composite model which conceives the incarnation as the coming together of two different "things" or "natures". Norris argues that there is a certain confusion in Cyril's Christological ideas but that "the coherence and originality of his thought lie in his consistent return to a linguistic model - a model of predication -to express the burden of his thoughts." Norris does not study the Christology of Cyril's *Commentary on John* or the categories that Cyril uses in the commentary to express his Christological ideas.

[54] Ibid., 93f.

typology to his emphasis upon the theme that Christ brought about a new creation and a renewal of humanity. Wilken points out that for Cyril the second Adam is the heavenly man who renews humanity.[55] He concludes against Liébaert that while the idea of Christ as mediator is important for Cyril's Christology, it is not accurate to claim that Cyril subordinated the redemption to the mediation of Christ. Wilken argues that Cyril did not really think of Christ in such a static way. On the contrary for Cyril the Son did not become man simply for the purpose of reconciling humanity and divinity in his person; the Son became man in order to die, rise from the dead and bring about a renewal and recreation.[56]

In 1975 Thomas Torrance published in his book *Theology in Reconciliation* a lecture he gave in 1973 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, entitled "The Mind of Christ: the Problem of Apollinarianism in the Liturgy"[57] This article discusses Cyril's Christology and theology of worship and is undoubtedly one of the most important studies of Cyril's thought in this century. Torrance, whose familiarity with Cyril's writings is considerable, argued brilliantly that for Cyril Christian worship is, can and only be, in and through Christ, our mediator and advocate before the Father. He claimed that for Cyril the priesthood of Christ was indissociable from Christ's "economic identification with us in the whole range and depth of our human experiences which he [Christ] shared with us."[58] Torrance sees Cyril as an eloquent spokesman for:

> "the mediation of salvation through the unimpaired humanity of Christ in which the activity of his human mind and soul in vicarious faith, worship and thanksgiving are essential ingredients. This implies a doctrine of the incarnation of the Son of God understood, not as the coming of God into man but as God becoming man, coming among us as man and therefore of God doing for us in a human way what we are unable to do ourselves ..."[59]

Torrance argues that for Cyril the soul of Christ was pivotal for Cyril's theology of worship as well as for his Christology and thinks that the characterization

---

[55] Ibid., 118.

[56] Ibid., 183. It should be noted that Liébaert's description of Cyril's concept of Christ as mediator does not correspond to Cyril's understanding of the mediation of Christ as it is found in the *Commentary On John*. This point is taken up later in this study.

[57] Thomas Torrance, "The Mind of Christ: The Problem of Apollinarianism in the Liturgy," *Theology in Reconciliation*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

[58] Ibid., 173.

[59] Ibid., 201.

of Cyril's Christology as Logos-sarx is a distortion. He also maintains that Cyril's theology of worship, with its understanding of Christ as high priest and mediator, is crucial for Cyril's Christology. Torrance points out that Cyril's profound concept of Christ as high priest is found especially in the *Commentary On John.* This commentary according to Torrance is one of the great patristic works on the theology of worship.[60] He claims that for Cyril because Christ is high priest and mediator, the faithful are enabled to share in Christ's human mind and can therefore be participants in Christ's "priestly presentation of himself and of us through himself to the Father."[61] Torrance concludes that for Cyril Christian worship is only with and through Christ where the faithful are united to the mind of Christ. This study discusses this important article at some length in the fourth chapter.

In 1977 there appeared Ezra Gebremedhin's monograph *Life-Giving Blessing: An Inquiry into the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria.*[62] The research of Gebremedhin comes to a conclusion which is the opposite of mine: Cyril applied his Christology to his theology of the eucharist and worship.[63] While Gebremedhin discusses some important features in Cyril's eucharistic theology, his presentation is problematic because he studies Cyril's Christology chiefly from the perspective of the Alexandrian's polemical writings and does not investigate at

[60] Ibid., 177.

[61] Ibid., 180.

[62] Ezra Gebremedhin, "Life-Giving Blessing: An Inquiry into the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Uppsala, 1977) The 1980's saw the appearance of the work of Bernard de Margerie and Ruth Siddals. See Bernard de Margerie, "L'exégèse christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Nouvelle Revue Theologique,* 102 (1980): 400-425. His article is a good summary and synthesis of the contemporary research as it bears mainly upon Cyril's exegetical method. De Margerie does not claim to study the Christology of Cyril's exegesis. Ruth Siddals, "Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1984) argued that Cyril developed his "Christological model" with the aid of Aristotelian and Porphyrian logic. She contends that Cyril uses the tool of logic to explicate the Nicene *homoousios*. Siddals studies Cyril's Christology mainly from the perspective of the dogmatic works especially the *Thesaurus*. Siddals suggests that Cyril understood John 1:14 as the Logos acquiring an accident (flesh) which really belongs to him. For Cyril the Logos becoming flesh is analogous to a man becoming a carpenter. There is a real change not in substance but in circumstance. Siddals went on to argue that Cyril's soteriology relied a great deal upon the neo-Platonic idea of the Infinite One. It is difficult to square this claim with Cyril's soteriology as foumd in his biblical commentaries. Her articles, which mainly contain material from her dissertation, are "Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria," *Journal of Theological Studies,* 38 (October 1987), 343-367; "Oneness and Difference in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria.," *Studia Patristica* v.28, (Louvain: Peeters Press, 1985): 207-211.

[63] Ibid., 12.

any length the Christology of Cyril's *Commentary on John* . More importantly, his work seems unaware that Cyril not only accepted but also strengthened the theological starting point of Athanasius which situated the mediating activity of the Son in his incarnate state. Similarly, Gebremedhin does not seem to recognize the central position that the Christ's priesthood holds in Cyril's theology of worship and eucharist.

In 1991 there appeared Lars Koen's dissertation "The Saving Passion: Incarnational and Soteriological Thought in Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John" Koen argues that Cyril had a holistic view of the person of Christ and his redemptive work. For Cyril the incarnation is never isolated or separated from redemption. Cyril's emphasis upon the nature of Christ is firmly connected to his emphasis upon the work of Christ. Throughout his monograph Koen claims that John 1:14 and Phil 5:2-11 constituted two loci in Cyril's Christology and soteriology. Koen sees Cyril's soteriology as multifaceted and cautions that Cyril's understanding of redemption should not be restricted to one model, although he claims Cyril especially stressed the sacrificial nature of Christ's death.[64] He sketches out in very broad strokes Cyril's understanding of the cross, sacrifice and passion of Christ and Cyril's understanding of recapitulation.[65] Koen correctly identifies some of Cyril's soteriological themes and his research certainly shows that it is not accurate to describe Cyril as a theologian who subordinated the redemption to a static concept of Christ as mediator along the lines suggested by Liébaert. On the other hand, Koen's work does not analyze in any great detail the importance of second Adam typology for Cyril's Christology in the *Commentary On John*. Furthermore, Koen did not explore the important place that the eucharist occupies for what he terms Cyril's soteriologcal synthesis. Cyril's understanding of the eucharist is not disconnected or isolated from his Christology or soteriology especially in his *Commentary On John.*

This present study will continue the contemporary revaluation of Cyril's Christology before the Nestorian crisis. Scholars have only just recently realized that any revaluation of Cyril's thought must take into account the Christology of his biblical commentaries, especially his *Commentary On John.* While some scholars argue that the eucharist is at heart and center of Cyril's religion and others

[64] Ibid., 132.

[65] Ibid., 105f.

point out that Cyril's Christology and soteriology are not separated from one another, scholars have neglected the inter-relationship and inter-connectedness between Cyril's soteriology, understanding of the eucharist and his Christology. This work is written in part to remedy this neglect.

Prolegomenon

Cyril's *Commentary On John* shows a Christian thinker seized by an insight which is at once soteriological and eucharistic: the union of the baptized in the Spirit with Christ to the Father. Cyril's thought is usually concerned with this soteriological insight and interest, which provides his theological point of departure: the event of salvation accomplished through Christ. For Cyril salvation is the unity of the baptized in the Spirit with Christ to the Father, and this salvation is communicated through the eucharist. In the eucharist, which for Cyril is always celebrated in the Spirit, the baptized partake of the life-giving flesh of Christ and are joined to Christ. Once the baptized are united to Christ they are united to the Father through Christ, who as the eternal Son is consubstantial with the Father. In the eyes of Cyril, this union of the baptized in the Spirit through Christ to the Father carries with it vast Christological implications. It demands an understanding of the incarnation in which the eternal Son of God becomes *sarx* in order to restore the communion with the Trinity that was lost through the sin of Adam. Thus Cyril's soteriological and eucharistic insight requires the unity of Christ and the communication of idioms. If either of these is denied then the baptized are united to a mere man in the eucharist and the gift which Adam lost cannot be restored or recovered.

Cyril's usual theological starting point is the event of salvation accomplished in Christ. This point of departure refused a rationalist attempt to formulate a Christian concept of God antecedent to and isolated from salvation history. It was precisely this sort of rationalism that pre-occupied the so-called "Arians" who attempted to reconcile a cosmological conception of God whereby the divine could not bear contact with the created world with the biblical message that God was immanent in human history.[66]

---

[66] By Cosmological I mean a philosophical view of God and the universe which does not locate its starting point in the historical revelation in Jesus the Christ. The *a priori* of such a philosophi-

The "Arians" assumed that the Christian revelation presented the problem of how to relate and link a transcendent deity with humanity. They supposed that there existed a chasm between God and humanity which could be closed only by the insertion into humanity of the semi-divine being - the Logos who was created by the true God. This semi-divine Logos was thus the mediator between the transcendent God and humanity. In this scheme the transcendent God cannot be immanent in history and cannot be incarnate, for he then would be limitable, therefore no longer fully divine. But the Logos who was created by the Father is limitable and capable of being incarnate. Therefore this created Logos can be said to have prayed, thirsted, hungered and suffered and died. The Son according to the "Arians" could have undergone these experiences not so much because he assumed a soulless human corporeality but because his "divinity" was something less than the true divinity of the transcendent and true God.

Not so for Cyril of Alexandria who was heir to the apostolic tradition defended by Athanasius which saw the event of salvation given in Christ as first and foremost in the explication of the Christian faith. The point of departure, which has been described by at least one scholar as an innovation which shook the traditional foundations of religious thought,[67] Cyril accepted as a given. For Cyril the starting point of theology was not how to relate a cosmologically conceived deity to humanity and history. Cyril supposed right from the start that the "chasm" that yawned between God and humanity was not due, as the "Arians" supposed, to a metaphysical antagonism between God and the human creature. What separated God from humanity was the sin, corruption and death which entered the human race through the sin of Adam and was reversed only by Christ. Cyril not only guarded and defended the point of departure which he inherited from Athanasius, he also deepened it. He shared with Athanasius the view that the mediating activity of Christ was located in his incarnate state. Cyril was able to realize this insight on a more profound level than his great predecessor.

Cyril's advance over Athanasius' Christology can best be seen in his theology of Christ as high priest and mediator between the baptized and the Father. As

---

cal view of the divine and of universe is not the historically revealed Trinity but some other god or gods known from philosophical speculation.

[67] Charles Kannengiesser, "Athanasius and the Foundations of Christology, " *Theological Studies* 34 (March 1973):, 112-13.

high priest Christ offers prayers and sacrifice to the Father as man without ceasing to be the eternal Son of God. For Cyril, there is no other way the baptized can come to the Father except through the prayers and sacrifice of Christ. This insight is liturgically experienced and inspired. Christ as high priest and mediator unites the baptized to himself by making them one with his ecclesial body thereby uniting them to the Father. In this scheme Christ is a mediator in and through his concrete historical person and actions.

Cyril articulates his emphasis upon Christ as high priest and mediator in terms of kenosis and the second Adam. These are his two primary Christological categories, especially in his *Commentary On John*. For Cyril, Christ the high priest, the mediator between the baptized and the Father, is the eternal Son who by having emptied himself out into *sarx* proved himself to be the second Adam. As the second Adam, Christ is the head of his body, the church. This headship of the second Adam, the *anakephalaiosis,* restores humanity to "the beginning" to the original state before the fall of Adam. This frequent assertion raises the question of how for Cyril the redeemed state in Christ is different from humanity's original condition prior to the fall. It also raises the question of the nature of humanity's fall. What was it exactly that humanity fell away from? At least at one point in his thought Cyril applied to creation his emphasis upon the Son as mediating in and through his incarnate state. In a passage in his *Thesaurus* Cyril appears to speak of a creation in Christ.[68] In this connection Christ is understood to be the foundation of creation, the original root who is the source of life before the fall and at the time of renewal. This speculation is a radical application of his christocentricism. To sure, Cyril did not consistently uphold his speculation about a creation in Christ. Often enough Cyril will speak of the time before the Son became man.[69]

---

[68] Cyril, *Thesaurus*, 15, (P.G. 75, 293-296) See Cyril's discussion of the meaning of Prov 8:22-25 in answer to the objections of the "herectics". This is examined in some detail in the fifth chapter of this work.

[69] This raises a difficult theological problem. When Cyril fixes his attention upon the non-human Logos he accepts, however unwittingly, at least an element of his opponents theological point of departure: a nonhistorical conception of God isolated from the mystery of the incarnation. To be sure, when Cyril speaks of a non-human Logos, he does not refer to the "Arian" concept of the Logos as a semi-divine creature. Nevertheless, his theological point of departure is no longer the historical event of salvation achieved in Christ. When Cyril's thought proceeds in this fashion the kenosis of the Logos and his being made flesh must refer to his entrance into personal unity with human nature. The chasm which separates God and humanity is then not only sin and corruption but created finitude itself. This problem must await the discussion in chapter five.

Cyril is perhaps most apt to speak of a non-human Logos when he argues against those opposed to the creed of Nicea. Despite the inconsistencies and detours in his thought, Cyril usually is intent upon the historical Christ rather than speculating about the functions of the non-human Logos. In his exegesis of scripture, especially in the *Commentary On John,* Cyril fixes his attention primarily upon the historical Christ and his redemptive work.

Chapter Two: Logos-Sarx? Cyril's Concept of Sarx

More than one interpreter of Cyril of Alexandria describes the christology of his early works as a Logos-sarx christology. While these interpreters admit that Cyril recognized the human soul of Christ they claim that Christ's soul is not a real factor in the Alexandrian patriarch's christology until after the Nestorian crisis. This interpretation supposes that Cyril understood *sarx* to mean body or unanimated corporeality. Such is the position of Aloys Grillmeier who, following the work of Jacques Liébaert,[1] locates Cyril's early christology in what he calls a "verbal Logos-sarx framework" in which the soul of Christ is only a physical factor but not a theological factor.[2] Christ is for all practical purposes only Logos and *sarx*. Grillmeier contends that the young Cyril attributed suffering only to Christ's flesh and not to Christ's soul.[3]

This whole matter is of some importance to this work which purports to call into question this sort of description of Cyril's early christology. If one supposes that Cyril understood *sarx* to mean unanimated corporeality, then one cannot help but misinterpret Cyril's understanding of the humanity of Christ as well as Cyril's soteriology. When scholars identify Cyril's early christology as a Logos-sarx christology they are also likely to characterize Cyril's understanding of

---

[1] Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique.*

[2] Grillmeier, *Christ In Christian Tradition,* 417.

[3] Ibid., 415-416.

redemption in terms of static mediation: divinity and humanity are united in Christ thus humanity is reconciled with God. There are problems with this presentation of Cyril's early thought. A close examination of Cyril's early works shows that the Logos-sarx framework cannot account for the christology therein where Cyril understands the term *sarx* as referring to a complete humanity, body and soul and where the Alexandrian bishop recognizes the soul as the principle of Christ's human action. Cyril's early thought, not only as it is found in the *Commentary on John,* assigned a clear soteriological function to the soul of Christ. Before proceeding any further it is first necessary to review in some detail the views of Grillmeier and Liébaert.

A) Cyril's early christology in the research of A. Grillmeier and J. Liébaert

Aloys Grillmeier identifies the *Thesaurus,* the sixth Dialogue of *De sancta et consubtantiale Trinitate, Homilia VIII* and the *Commentary on John* as the sources for Cyril's early christology. Grillmeier claims in his widely read *Christ In Christian Tradition* that in Cyril's early christology "we find the Athanasian Logos-sarx christology in its pure form."[4] Closely following the work of Jacques Liébaert[5], he points out that the christological chapters of the *Thesaurus* (according to Grillmeier chs. 22-24 and 28) are largely paraphrases of *Contra Arianos* III (35-37). Grillmeier acknowledges that Cyril makes modifications to the arguments of Athanasius, but argues that Cyril did not intend to make any significant changes to the thought of his master. On the other hand, Grillmeier admits that Cyril recognizes the human soul of Christ, but claims that the soul is not a theological factor in Cyril's christology until the Nestorian crisis. Furthermore, in Grillmeier's estimation the early Cyril, like his great predecessor Athanasius, did not question the basic Christological principle of the "Arians" whereby the Logos takes the place of the soul in Christ. According to Grillmeier both Athanasius and the younger Cyril:

> "... recognize the reality of the sufferings, and both attribute them to the 'sarx'. There are only πάθη τῆς σαρκός, sufferings of the flesh, *and no real sufferings*

---

[4] Ibid., 415.

[5] Jacques Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique*

> *of the* ψυχή. The 'flesh' is also the recipient of gifts, of holiness and of glory. Throughout his argument, which is directed against the Arians, Cyril never once thinks of attacking the basic christological principle on which they rely, that the Logos is the soul of Christ. He disputes only the consequences which the heretics draw from it for the nature of the Logos. Apollinarianism and the church's struggle against it seem to be virtually unknown to the author of the Thesaurus and the Dialogues."[6]

It clearly supposed here that Cyril understood *sarx* to signify unanimated corporeality. Grillmeier does acknowledge that in Cyril's early christology a "spiritual principle" senses the movements of the flesh, but contends that Cyril is not clear as to what he means by this spiritual principle.[7] For Grillmeier, the importance of the soul as a soteriological and theological factor first shows up in Cyril's theology during the Nestorian crisis especially in the Patriarch's second letter to Succensus and in *Oratio ad Pulcheriam et Eudocuiam augustas de fide*.[8] Both letters predicate suffering not only of the body, but of the soul as well. It is only the Cyril of the Nestorian controversy, who finally makes the soul of Christ the principle of suffering, recognizes a real human psychology in Christ and thus goes beyond the Logos-sarx christology.[9]

Jacques Liébaert argued throughout his monograph, *La Doctrine Christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle Nestorienne,* that while Cyril affirmed that the Word assumed a body animated by a rational soul, he continued to think and theologize within a Logos-sarx christology. Cyril's recognition of the soul of Christ was not integrated into his wider christological thought. The

---

[6] Grillmeier, *Christ In Christian Tradition*, 415-416. Henry Chadwick is of the opinion that Cyril "had nothing to say about the part played by Christ's soul in the Passion." See "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy" *Journal of Theological Studies,* 2 (n.s.) (1951): 159. J.N.D. Kelly argues that Cyril assigned no practical functions to the soul before the controversy with Nestorius. See his *Early Christian Doctrines,* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978) 322-323.

[7] Grillmeier, *Christ In Christian Tradition*, 417, n.6.

[8] Grillmeier claims (*Christ In Christian Tradition*, 415, n.4) that in his works before Ephesus, Cyril only mentions the soul of Christ twice, specifically in *Homilia 8* (PG 77, 573B) and in the *Glaphyra in Genesim,* Bk 6 (PG 69, 297C). Actually, there are at least four other places in his pre-Ephesine works where Cyril explicitly refers to the soul of Christ. He mentions the soul of Christ in *Homilia 8* (PG 77, 569) and in his *Commentary on Malachi,* Bk.2 (PG 72, 332); *Commentary on Isaiah,* Bk.3 (PG 70, 393AB); *Commentary on John,* Bk.2, Ch.5 (Cyril's comments on John 6:27).

[9] Ibid., 474-6. Grillmeier also cites a passage from Cyril's *Scholia de incarnatione unigentiti* (P.G.75, 1377 AC) where Cyril indicates that he understands the significance of the human obedience of Christ in the context of the soul. There is general agreement among scholars that Cyril completed the *Scholia* around time of the Nestorian crisis.

christology of Cyril's early thought, according to Liébaert, has no room for the human psychology of Christ. He submits that Cyril follows his predecessor Athanasius and attributes fear and agony to the flesh of Christ:

> "La solution de Cyrille reste celle d'Athanase: c'est là une des exigences de la condition humaine qu'il a revêtue, comme les pleurs, l'angoisse, la crainte. Dans cette explication, on cherche vainment la trace d'une psychologie humaine du Christ; tout est ramené cette fois encore aux "πάθη τῆς σαρκός" [sufferings of the flesh].[10]

There is little doubt here that Liébaert assumes that Cyril understood the term *sarx* denote the body. He argues that in Cyril's early christology, the human soul of Christ is not the principle of Christ's human action. According to Liébaert, Cyril could think in this way because, like his master Athanasius, he thought and moved from within an anthropology that was common to his day.[11] This anthropology, as Liébaert describes it was Platonic not Aristotlean and understood the human person not as a composite of body and soul but as a union of spirit and a corporeal nature that included the body and the soul. The human person is conceived of as an incarnate spirit. More specfically, as a spirit trapped and imprisoned in a corporeal nature.[12] Liébaert wrote:

> L'évêque d'Alexandrie demeure fidèle à l'anthroplogie courante de son temps. Au fond de sa christologie, Il y a cette idée que l'homme est un esprit incarné et que, par consequent, c'est unissant, non pas à une âme, mais à une chair qu'un esprit devient homme. Dans cette perspective, l'âme n'entrer pas en ligne de compte dans le processus de l'Incarnation; elle n'a pas non plus de rôle à jouer dans le systèm christologique construit sur cette base. Le fait que la chair assumée par le Verbe était animée d'une âme spirtuelle peut bien être reconnu par Cyrille; il n'entre pas dans sa définition de l'Incarnation et voilà pourquoi l'âme du Sauveur apparaît si peu dans la christologie cyrillienne avant 428.[13]

---

[10] Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique,* 124.

[11] Whether this accurately describes the anthropology of Athanasius is open to very serious questioning. A recent study of Athanasius' anthropology has rejected Liébaert's claim that Athanasius understood the human subject as a spirit trapped in flesh. See Alvyn Pettersen, *Athanasius and the Human Body,* (Bristol: The Bristol Press, 1990). Pettersen argues convincingly that for Athanasius God created the body to exist with its soul and that this unity of body and soul constitutes true humanity. Through the body the soul is capable of acting and expressing itself while at the same time providing the body with direction and animation. Pettersen points out that for Athanasius the "fundamental ontological divide" is not between the spiritual and the material but between God and the order of creation.

[12] Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique,* 147-149.

[13] Ibid., 158.

Thus in Liébaert's opinion, if Cyril's thought presupposed an anthropology that understood a human person to be a spirit trapped in flesh rather than a substantial composite of body and soul, then it is not very difficult to see why Cyril, like Athanasius, could find little room for the activity of the human soul of Christ. It is not surprising then to find Liébaert arguing that for Cyril the Word became flesh in order that he might become a mediator between God and humanity. Christ is a mediator because in him humanity and divinity have been joined together. Liébaert comes to the conclusion that Cyril rigorously subordinated the redemption to the incarnation:

> ... le Verbe incarné *est homme* parce qu'uni à une chair et *est Dieu* parce que dans ce devenir-homme sa nature divine est demeurée inchangée. Et c'est parce qu'il unit ainsi en lui <<l'humanité>> et, <<la divinité>> (condition humaine et condition divine) qu'il réconcile la Divinité et Humanité (Dieu et les hommes). Chez Cyrille, la Rédemption est ainsi subordonnée rigoureusement à la médiation du Christ et celle-ci à son Incarnation.[14]

In Liébaert's opinion not only is Cyril's conception of the person of Christ static, but so too his understanding of the work of Christ. Cyril, according to Liébaert, was unable to understand the soul of Christ as the principle of Christ's human action and could not avoid reducing the redemption to the incarnation thereby de-emphasizing and underestimating the import of the historical work and actions of Christ.

There is clear evidence, however, not only in Cyril's *Commentary on John* but also in his early dogmatic works, which shows that Cyril understood *sarx* to signify a full and complete humanity, composed of body and soul. Thus when the Alexandrian patriarch attributes sufferings and passions to the flesh of the incarnate Word he does not thereby exclude the soul as a principle of suffering. Cyril knows that humans are subject not only to passive passions proper to the body such as hunger, thirst and weariness, he also knows that humans experience active passions proper to the soul such as fear, sadness, grief and agony. Cyril holds that Christ, unlike sinful human beings, was able to overcome these active passions for our sake. The soul of Christ, therefore, has an indispensable soteriological function. In this way, the "young" Cyril positively goes beyond a Logos-sarx

---

[14] Ibid., 229. Wilken is critical of Liébaert on this point see *Judaism and Early Christian Mind,* 182-183.

Christology and does not simply describe redemption solely in regard to the mere fact that humanity and divinity are united in the person of Christ.

B) The Meaning of Sarx in the Thought of Cyril

Herman Diepen in his *Aux origines de l'anthropologie de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie,*[15] forcefully challenged many of the conclusions that Liébaert reached about Cyril's anthropology and Christology. Diepen's book, which did not receive the attention it deserved, took particular issue with Liébaert's opinion that Cyril's anthropology was at bottom Platonist or neo-Platonist. Diepen pointed out, for instance, that Liébaert misunderstood Cyril's use of the term *sarx* and overlooked Cyril's specific repudiation in the *Commentary on John* of any anthropology that understood the soul as not properly belonging in union with the body. Cyril amassed an array of biblical texts to condemn in twenty-four separate arguments the idea that the body was a punishment or prison for the soul and the idea that the soul pre-existed the body. The twenty-fourth argument probably best sums up Cyril's rejection of this sort of anthropology:

> God created all things in incorruption and he made not death, but through envy of the devil came death into the world. (Wisdom 1:13; 2:24) But if it be true, that the body was given in nature of punishment to the soul of man, why, sirs, should we accuse the envy of the devil for bringing in to us the termination of wretchedness and destroying the body which is our punishment? And for what in the world do we offer thanks to the Savior for having again bound us to the flesh through the resurrection? Yet we do indeed give thanks, and the envy of the devil has vexed our nature, procuring corruption to our bodies. No mode of punishment then is the body nor yet is it the wages of our former sins.[16]

Cyril will have nothing to do with a dualism whereby the body, part of God's good creation, is innately antagonistic to the soul. For Cyril the resurrection tells us something about the nature of human existence: the body is an essential element of the human constitution and of human identity. The Alexandrian patriarch recognized that to conceive of the human person as a spirit or soul trapped in a body denies and fails to understand what Christ did for humanity when he rose from the dead. Diepen also pointed out that even in his early works Cyril did not

[15] Herman Diepen, *Aux origines de l'anthropologie de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie,* (Paris: Desclee de Brovwer,1957)

[16] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.1 Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 98-99; *In Joannem,* v.1, 126)

use to the word *sarx* to mean unanimated corporeality. In his Easter letter of 420, only eight years after his elevation to the episcopate, Cyril wrote:

> This is not the occasion for us to deny those things dissimilar according to nature, namely, being on the one hand properly a share in the splendor of the Father, and in the other flesh taken from the earth, that is to say man in his completeness. (τὸ ἀπὸ γης σαρκίον ἤτοι τελείως τὸν ἄνθρωπον.) However, after having distinguished these (two) realities and having separated by thought alone the ideas of each one, we must draw them together immediately into unity. For according to the holy evangelist "the Word was made flesh." Not by transformation into flesh, -- he does not say this. Then in place of speaking of man in his totality, he has named flesh.(ἀντὶ δὲ του ἄνθρωπος ὁλοκλήρως ει' πειν τὴν σάρκα ὠνόμασεν).[17]

In the eyes of Cyril, scripture uses the word *sarx* to signify the full and complete human reality. In his *Commentary on John*, he makes this point in his exegesis of John 1:14 and leaves no doubt that he understands *sarx* in this sense, especially in regard to the incarnation:

> He [John] has now entered openly upon the declaration of the Incarnation. For he plainly sets forth that the Only-Begotten became and is called son of man. For this and nothing else does his saying that the Word was made flesh signify. It is as though he said more clearly "The Word was made man." And in thus speaking he introduces again to us not the strange or unusual, seeing that the divine Scripture often times calls the whole creature by the name of flesh alone, as in the prophet Joel: "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." We do not suppose that the prophet says that the divine Spirit should be bestowed upon human flesh soulless and alone (for this would be by no means free from absurdity). Comprehending the whole by the part, he names man from the flesh ...But he [the prophet] says not that the Word came into flesh but that It was made flesh, that you may not suppose that he came to it as in the case of the prophets or other of the saints by participation, but did himself become actual flesh, that is man ...[18]

Later in the *Commentary on John*, in his comments on John 9:27, Cyril writes:

> For the Son is one and only one, both before his conjunction with the flesh, and when he came with flesh; and by flesh we denote man in his integrity, I mean consisting of soul and body.[19]

---

[17] Cyril, *Homilia 8.*(PG 73, 569) Translation mine. This text is cited by Diepen, *Aux origenes de l'Anthropologie de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie,* 37.

[18] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.1 Ch.9 (tr. Pusey, v.1 108-109)

[19] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk. 6, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, *Commentary on The Gospel according to S. John,* v. 2. Oxford, 1885, 55; *In Joannem,* v.2, 200) Add to this Cyril 's comments on Malachi 3:1 (PG 73, 332) where it said that flesh denotes a full humanity, body and soul. One scholar who recognizes that Cyril interpreted *sarx* biblically is Robert Wilken who draws attention

There is clear evidence then that Cyril did not use the word *sarx* to refer to unanimated corporeality. There is also no reason to suppose from these passages that Cyril thought of human nature as a spirit trapped in a body. Moreover, if Cyril really had conceived of human nature in this way, then it certainly would have been evident in passages where Cyril explicitly identifies what elements constitute human nature in its totality. Cyril should be taken at his word. His use of the term *sarx* is biblical rather than philosophical. Cyril's conviction that *sarx* refers to a complete humanity, body and soul, must be kept in mind when scholars interpret texts in Cyril's early works where psychological sufferings are attributed to the flesh of Christ. The Alexandrian patriarch did not simply verbally admit the existence of Christ's soul and then continued to read *sarx* to mean unanimated corporeality.

Cyril knew that the human soul was subjected to psychological passions. He claimed in one of his earliest works, *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et vertitate*, a commentary on the Pentateuch, that before baptism the human soul was enslaved to the passions. Robert Wilken has shown that throughout this work Cyril is intent upon showing that Christianity is the fulfillment and transformation of Judaism into a new and better way of life.[20] This new way of life in Christ is inward, spiritual, a matter of the heart and characterized by worship in spirit and truth. In the third book of *De Adoratione* Cyril discusses and interprets the journey of the Israelites through the desert. Cyril focuses his attention upon the pillar of the cloud that covered the Israelites in the desert protecting them from their Egyptian enemies. Following Paul in 1Cor 2:10, the bishop of Alexandria maintains that the Israelites were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea and that this foreshadowed and foretyped baptism in Christ. Cyril goes on to

---

to Cyril's comments on John 1:14 and also cites Cyril's comments on Is 40:3-5 taken from the *Commentary on Isaiah*, Bk.3 (PG 70, 804AB) "But when he became man, or flesh, according to the Scriptures he destroyed sin." See *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*, 108 n.36. G. Jouassard recognizes that Cyril's use of *sarx* does not exclude the soul but goes on to argue that Cyril regarded the soul as impassible. See G. Jouassard, "Saint Cyrille et le schéma de l'incarnation verbe-chair" *Recherches de science religieuse*, 44 (1956): 241f. "Un problèm d'anthropologie et de christologie chez saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie" Recherches de science religieuse, 43 (1955): 361f. G.M. Durand, *Deux dialogues christologique*, Sources chrétieme, v.97 (Paris, 1964), 40 also recognizes that Cyril reads *sarx* biblically. Nevertheless, Durand does not integrate this insight into his analysis of Cyril's theology.

[20] Wilken, *Judaism and Early Christian Mind*, 84-85.

explain further that baptism in Christ empowers the baptized to overcome the passions that afflict the soul. Cyril wrote:

> The soul of man which comes to escape the slavery of the passions and is converted to a better life, wanting to follow the divine law, still remains delicate and weak. It is easily frightened at the sight of the pains to be borne and of the necessity of the struggle. The former life smiles at it anew. Before holy baptism, the soul of man is lazy in the face of the struggle and ready to submit to slavery. It is entirely fearful. But when it has received a share in the grace it is clothed with virtue from on high, it is on the contrary very courageous in defending itself against its persecutors, and valiantly it undertakes the struggle. But it escapes easily the attack of its enemies since Christ is its leader and defender.[21]

To find Cyril claiming that the human soul is subject to the slavery of the passions and liberated from them in only in Christ is not surprising given that throughout his commentary he argues that Christianity is the transformation of Judaism into a new way of life that is inward and spiritual. In his *Thesaurus*, Cyril claims that Christ bore the very passions which held the human soul in bondage and that the Savior freed humanity from them. Reference has been made above to the fact that Cyril's *Thesaurus* is a collection of "Arian" objections to the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son. In assertio xxiv of the *Thesaurus* Cyril answers those who ask how Christ can be divine by nature if he underwent things proper to humanity such as weeping, fear and sorrow. Cyril gives eleven solutions and answers to this objection. In his seventh solution Cyril writes:

> By his own death the Savior destroyed death. As it were death has not been destroyed if he has not died himself. So thus for each of the passions of the flesh. If he had not feared the nature [humanity] has not been freed from fear; if he was not sad, it [humanity] has not been freed from sadness; if he was not troubled, it [humanity] has never been freed of that. And applying the same reasoning to all that which is proper to the humanity you will find the passions of the flesh in

[21] Cyril, *De adoratione et cultu spiritu et veritate,* Bk.3 (PG 68, 273) Translation mine. This text is cited by Diepen, *Aux origines de l'anthropologie de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie,* 50. Another passage which shows that Cyril regarded the soul as subject to the passions is found in the *Commentary on John.* During the course of his comments on John 14:20 Cyril argues against those claimed that the soul of Adam resulted from the divine inbreathing referred to in Genesis 2:7. Cyril argues that:

> If any suppose that the Divine inbreathing became a soul, let him tell us whether it was turned aside from its own nature and has been made into a soul, or has it remained in its own identity? For if they say it has been in anyway changed and that it traversed the law of its own nature, they will be convicted of blasphemy; for they will say that the immutable and ever-unchanging nature is altogether mutable; whereas if it was in no wise turned aside, but has ever remained what it always was, after coming forth from God, that is to say, his inbreathing, how did it turn to sin, and become susceptible of so great diversity of passions? (καί τοσαύτης παθῶν διαφορας γεγονε δεκτικόν;) *Commentary on John,* Bk.9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2 319; *In Joannem,* v.2, 485)

movement in Christ. For they **were not victorious as in us, but they** were abolished by the power of the Word **dwelling in the flesh, and the nature** [human] was changed for the better.[22]

Recalling Cyril's understanding of *sarx* as signifying a full humanity, body and soul, there is no reason to conclude from this passage that Cyril meant to claim here that the body of Christ was the principle of fear and sorrow. On the contrary, for Cyril if Christ was not afflicted with the same active passions by which all human souls were afflicted then redemption is not complete. Cyril can

---

[22] Cyril, *Thesaurus*, 24, PG 75, 397C. Translation mine. Before the Nestorian controversy Cyril sometimes uses indwelling language in reference to the incarnate Christ. It should be pointed out here that this passage from the Thesaurus bears a striking resemblance to a passage in Book eight of the *Commentary on John.* Book eight of course is composed of fragments taken from the catenae and therefore must approached with great caution. The language in the passage above from the *Thesaurus* occurs almost word for word in the Greek original in Book eight of the *Commentary on John* where Cyril comments upon John 12:27 ("Now my soul is troubled"). This would seem to authenticate at least this portion of the text that purports to be Cyril's closing remarks on John 12:27. The Greek original of our passage in the *Thesaurus* runs as follows:

> Τω οἰκείω θανάτω τὸν θάνατον κατήργησεν ὁ Σωττήρ. Ωσπερ ουν οὐκ ἄν ὁ θανατος κατηργήθη μὴ ἀποθανόντος αὐτου, οὕτως ἐφ' ἑκάστου των της σαρκὸς παθων. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ εδειλίασεν, οὐκ ἄν ελευθέρα του δειλιαν ἡ φύσις ἐγένετο, εἰ μὴ ἐλυπηθη, οὐκ ἄν ἀπηλλάχθη του λυπεισθαί ποτε, εἰ μὴ ἐταράχθη, οὐκ ἂν εξω ποτὲ τουτων ἐγένετο. Καί εφ ἑκάστω των ἀνθρωπίνως γεγονότων τὸν αυτὸν εφαρμόζων λόγον, ευρήσεις ἐν χριστω τὰ της σαρκὸς πάθη κεκινημένα, οὐχ ἵνα κρατήση ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν ἡμιν, αλλ' ἵνα κινηθέντα καταρηθη τη δυνάμει του ἐνοικησαντος τη σαρκί Λόγου, πρὸς τὸ ἄμεινον μεταποιουμένης της φόσεως.

Cyril's remarks on John 12:27 *Commentary on John* are very similar :

> Ωσπερ μέντοι οὐκ ἄλλως ὁ θάνατος κατηργήθη, μὴ ἀποθανότος του Σωτηρὸς. οὕτω καὶ ἐφ' ἑκάστουτων της σαρκὸς παθων. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐδειλίασεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐν ἐλευθερία του δειλιαν ἡ φύσις γέγονεν· ειμὴ ἐλυπήθη, οὐκ ἂν ἀπηλλάγη του λυπεισθαί ποτε· εἰ μὴ ἐταράχθη καὶ ἐποτήθη, οὐκ ἂν ἔξω ποτὲ τούτων ἐγένετο. Καὶ ἐφ' ἑκάστω των ἀνθρωπίως γεγονότων, τὸν αὐτόν ἐφαρμόζοντα λόγον ευρήσεὶς ἐν Χριστω· τα της σαρκὸς πάθη κεκινημένα, οὐχ ἵνα κρατήση ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν ἡυίν, αλλ' ἵνα κινηθέντα καταργηθη τη δυνάμει του ἐνοικησαντος τη σαρκί Λόγου, πρὸς τὸ ἄμεινον μεταποιουμένης της φόσεως.

Thomas Randall (*Commentary on John,* v.2, 154; *In Joannem*, v.2, 320) gives this translation of Cyril's comments on John 12:27:

> Moreover, just as death was brought to nothing in no other way than by the death of the savior, so also with regard to the sufferings of the flesh. For unless he had felt dread, human nature could not have become free from dread; unless he had experienced grief, there could never have been any deliverance from grief; unless he had been troubled and alarmed, no escape from these feelings could have been found. And with regard to every one of the affections to which human nature is liable, you will find exactly the corresponding thing in Christ. The affections of his flesh were aroused, not that they might have the upper hand as they do indeed in us, but in order that they might be thoroughly subdued by the power of the Word dwelling in the flesh, the nature of man thus undergoing a change for the better.

If this is the way Cyril interpreted John 12:27 ("Now my soul is troubled,") then it is further evidence that my interpretation of the passage from the *Thesaurus* is a correct one.

hardly mean to answer the "Arian" objection by arguing that the Logos qua Logos underwent fear and sorrow. Given all this, it is not unjustifiable to draw the conclusion that Cyril means in this passage that the eternal Son of God frees human beings from psychic passions in and through his own human soul. The humanity of Christ, including his human soul, is the principle of the human actions and movements of the eternal Son. In other words, Cyril saw the full humanity of Christ, inclusive of the soul, as having a real soteriological function before the Nestorian crisis. One cannot help seeing Cyril upholding a soteriological argument: that which was not assumed was not redeemed. For Cyril this goes not only for the human body but for the human soul as well.

Cyril's use of the word *sarx* to signify a complete humanity, body and soul, is important for interpreting some of the research of J. Liébaert. Liébaert showed that numerous chapters of Cyril's *Thesaurus* are summaries of certain sections of Athanasius' *Contra Arianos* III.[23] In Liébaert's estimation there are some differences in terminology between Cyril and Athanasius with regard to the human passions of Christ. He compares chapter 24 of the *Thesaurus* with chapters 54-57 of *Contra Arianos* III. Liébaert notices that Cyril, unlike Athanasius, avoids attributing the human passions to Christ's body [σῶμα]. Cyril prefers to attribute the passions to the flesh [σαρξ] or the humanity [ἀνθρωπότης] of Christ. Body [σῶμα] appears only twice in chapter 24 of the *Thesaurus* while in *Contra Arianos* III it appears 16 times. *Sarx* [σαρξ] on the other hand, appears 18 times in *Contra Arianos* and 27 times in the *Thesaurus*. Finally, variations of humanity [ανθρωπότης] (e.g. ὡς ἄνθρωπος; τὰ ἀνθρώπινα; ἀνθρωπίως; ἀνθρωπιώτερον; τά ἀνθρώπω πρέποντα;) are more frequent in the *Thesaurus* than in *Contra Arianos*.[24] Liébaert considers the differences minute and thinks that Cyril merely softens the vocabulary of Athanasius and cautions that too much should not be read into the differences of terminology between Cyril and Athanasius. The differences in vocabulary are more significant than Liébaert noticed. Given that

[23] Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique*, 83. Specifically, Liébaert has demonstrated that chapters 22-24, 28 of the *Thesaurus* are largely paraphrases of chapters 35-57 of *Contra Arianos* III, chapter 22 has to do with the ignorance of Christ on the day of judgment and corresponds to *Contra Arianos* III chapters 42-50. Chapter 23 is concerned with the gifts received by Christ and is parallel to *Contra Arianos* III chapters 35-36, 38-41. Chapter 24 has to do with the passions felt by Christ and corresponds to *Contra Arianos* III chapters 54-57. Lastly, chapter 28 has to do with the advance in wisdom and grace in Christ and is in parallel with *Contra Arianos* III 51-53.

[24] Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique*, 124.

Cyril understood sarx to signify the full humanity of Christ, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that Cyril preferred attributing suffering and passions to the flesh of Christ rather than to Christ's body because he did not regard them as mere bodily phenomena. Cyril may well summarize large portions of the *Contra Arianos* in his *Thesaurus* but his preference of attributing the passions to the flesh rather than to the body is an important adjustment to the thought of Athanasius.

1) The Soul of Christ in the Commentary on John

Cyril's understanding of the importance of the soul of Christ for redemption continued to develop in his commentary on the gospel according to John. In his comments on John 6:38 Cyril's understanding of the human psychology of Christ reaches a new depth. In John 6:38 Christ says that "For I have not come down from heaven to do my will, but the will of the one who sent me." Cyril asks what it was that Christ both willed and unwilled and then claims that this willing and unwilling [and] refers to the forthcoming suffering and death of Christ.[25]

He writes:

[25] I am aware that Liébaert argues that this section of Book 4 in the *Commentary on John* was not written by Cyril despite the fact that it appears in the direct manuscript tradition and is not taken from the catenae. Liébaert's argument against the authenticity of our passage is not convincing. Specifically, Liébaert argues that nowhere in the *Commentary on John,* with the exception of-Books seven and eight which he believes are spurious, does Cyril attribute a human psychology to Christ. According to Liébaert, Cyril is at pains to avoid predicating psychic suffering to Christ. Liébaert reasons that it is not likely then that Cyril would suddenly speak of a human psychology in Christ and therefore our passage in Book 4 is an interpolation. This claim of course is based largely on Liébaert's assumption that Cyril understood *sarx* in the sense of unanimated corporeality. More seriously, Liébaert's internal argument against authenticity collapses when one pays close attention to two passages in two of Cyril's later works, *Quod unus sit Christus,* (ed. G.M. Durand, *Deux dialogues christologiques*, Sources chrétiennes, v.97 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1964, 492f) and *Libri V contra Nestorium* Bk 3 (*Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum,* ed. E. Schwartz, Berlin, 1914-1941, I, I, 6, 98- 9. Hereafter referred to as A.C.O.) In the passage in the latter work, Cyril repeats in summary form the material in Book 4. Cyril even cites the same texts of scripture, John 6:38 and Matt 26:39, to make the point that Christ recoiled from the passion and yet willed the passion. In the passage *in Quod unus sit Christus* (Sources chrétiennes, v.97, 492f) Matt 26:39 is interpreted in the same way: the passion is both unwilled and willed. Cyril's exegesis of Matt 26:39 and John 6:38 is consistent. Given this consistency it is difficult to sustain the idea that Book 4 is an interpolation.

.. he [Christ] accepts the suffering, he makes what he willed not, his will, for the value sake of His passion, God the Father agreeing with him, and co-approving that he should readily undergo all things for the salvation of all. Here especially do we see the boundless goodness of the divine nature, in that it refuses not to make that which is spurned its choice for our sake. But that the suffering on the cross was unwilled by our Savior Christ, yet willed for our sake and the good pleasure of the God the Father, you will hence understand. For when he was about to ascend thereto, he made his addresses to God, saying, that is, in the form of prayer, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as you." For in that he is God the Word, immortal, incorruptible, and life itself by nature, he could not shudder at death, I think is most clear to all: yet made in the flesh he suffers the flesh to undergo things proper to it, and permits it to shudder at death when now at its doors, (Επιτρέπει γε μήν, ὡς ἐν σαρκὶ γεγονώς ὑπομένειν τὰ ἴδια τον σαρκὶ, καὶ γεγονότα λοιπον ἐπὶ θυραις ὑποπτήσσειν ἐα τὸν θάνατον) that he may be shown to be in truth man ... [26]

Cyril explains here that Word is capable of fearing the death because he was in the flesh. To be sure, Cyril claims that fear of death is proper to the flesh but he does not think of the flesh as somehow separate from the Word. For Cyril the subject of fear is the Word who made the flesh his own. The bishop of Alexandria's thought then reaches a new depth when he goes on to explain that Christ possessed real human will. Explaining John 6:38 by Matt 26:39 ("Father if it be possible, let this cup pass ...") Cyril writes:

.. therefore he says, "If be possible, let this cup pass from me." If it may be (He says) Father, that I, without suffering death, may gain life for them, that have fallen thereunto, if death may die without my dying in the flesh, that is, let this cup (he says) pass from me; but since it will not take place (he says) otherwise, "not as I will, but as you." *You see how powerless (Ορας ὅπως ἀτονουσα μὲν πάλιν ἡ ἀνθρώπου φύσις,* καὶ ἐν αὐτω τω χριστω τὸ ὅσον εἰς ἑαυτὴν, ευρίσκεται·) human nature is found, even in Christ himself. But it is brought back through the Word united with it unto God-befitting courage and is retrained to the noble purpose, so as not to commit itself to what seems good to its own will but rather to follow the divine aim, and readily to run to whatever the Law of its Creator calls us ... For Christ was not ignorant that it is very far beneath God-befitting dignity, to seem to be overcome by death and feel the dread of it ... saying that the flesh was weak, by reason of what befits it and belongs to it by nature; but that the spirit was willing, knowing that it suffered nothing that could harm. You see how death was unwilled by Christ, by reason of the flesh,

[26] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.4, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 384; *In Joannem*, v. 1, 486-7) Thomas Torrance has argued rightly that Cyril's idea that the kenosis of the Son gave rise to human experiences which were unwilled (above all in the passion) shows that the Alexandrian had in mind a kenosis which was a voluntary and free act of the Son rather than a necessary kenosis. See his *Theology in Reconciliation*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976) at 161-162

> and the disgracefulness of suffering: yet **willed, until he should have** brought unto its destined consummation for the whole **world the good pleasure** of the Father, that is, the salvation and life of all?[27]

Cyril came to see that if the soul of Christ underwent psychological passions then it followed that Christ possessed a weak human will. For Cyril, Christ's struggle in Gethsemane manifests distinction between the human activity and the divine activity in Christ. Christ's powerless human nature, with its will afraid of death, is not totally overcome with fear but is redirected to the divine resolve. Nevertheless, there is a real tension here between the divine will and the human will of Christ. This passage shows that Cyril knew something of an inner struggle within Christ.[28] Without a doubt, Cyril sees the humanity of Christ as the principle of his human activity. Cyril of course does not conceive of a separate human subject in Christ. Such a division is unthinkable for someone who is so insistent upon the unity of Christ. It is not surprising to find Cyril writing later in his *Commentary on John* "If he conquered as God, then it profits us nothing; but if as a man, we conquered in him. For he is to us the Second Adam come from heaven according to the scriptures."[29] It is difficult to reconcile all this with Liébaert's claim[30] that Cyril refrains from assigning a human psychology to Christ. Similarly, Cyril's comments here are hard to square with Grillmeier's claim that in Cyril's early works there is the thought of Athanasius and nothing else.[31] Compare Cyril's comments with Athanasius' interpretation of Matt 26:39 in *Contra Arianos*, III. There Athanasius wrote:

> It was God who made the act of the will, but as he had become man he wore flesh which was afraid, and by this flesh he mingled his own will with the human weakness in order that he should by abolishing this (weakness) render man more

[27] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.4, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 385; *In Joannem*, v. 1, 486-7) Emphasis mine.

[28] The tenth Act of the second ecumenical Council of Constantinople (681) cites Book 4 of the *Commentary on John* as part of the patristic witness to the existence of Christ's human will Mansi, J.D., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, v.11. (Florence, 1759-1798) 144.

[29] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.11, Ch.2 (tr. Thomas Randall, v.2, 477); *In Joannem*, v. 2, 657) Cyril comments here on John 16:33. His comments on John 6:51 4, 2 (tr. Pusey, v.1 409) are also pertinent here: I die (he says) for all, that I may quicken all by myself. And I made my flesh a ransom for the flesh of all. For death shall die my death, and with me shall rise again (he says) the fallen nature of man. For this I became like you, man (that is) and the seed of Abraham, that I might be made like in all things unto my brethren.

[30] Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique,* 133.

[31] Grillmeier, *Christ In Christian Tradition*, 414-415.

> courageous in the face of death ... Just as he abolished death by dying ... so by his so-called (νομιζομένη) cowardice he removed our cowardice and caused men no longer to fear death.[32]

Even if, as it has been suggested by some scholars,[33] Athanasius understood *sarx* to mean a complete humanity, body and soul, he certainly did not intend to say that the human will of Christ really experienced fear. Athanasius' interpretation of Matt 26:39 is different from Cyril's. For Cyril the flesh has a will of its own which truly belongs to the Logos who really trembles before death. Cyril surpasses his great master Athanasius when he affirms the unwilling and willing of the Passion. He even anticipates an objection to this presentation of Christ. During the course of Cyril's comments on John 6:38 an interlocutor protests to Cyril saying that the Son was involuntarily subject to the Father. In other words, Christ's involuntary subjection to the Father is by necessity: the very being of the Son consists in being subject to the Father.[34]

Cyril's reply is concerned for upholding the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son and showing that the Son's obedience does not mean that the Son is inferior to the Father. He begins to answer the his interlocutor's objection by pointing out that subjection has no existence in itself. Moreover, if the being of man consisted in being subject, it would also follow that non-existence for a man consists in not-being-subject. Cyril asks, "How then was it said by the Psalmist to some one, as being indeed and existing, but not yet subjected, *submit to the Lord, and beseech Him.*"[35] Secondly, Cyril argues that "greater" or "less" cannot be predicated strictly of essences. Therefore "greater" or "less" cannot apply to the essence of the Son. After concluding that the objection of his interlocutor's objection is nonsensical, Cyril repeats his earlier claim that the passion was unwilled in that Christ was man in the flesh. Furthermore, for Cyril "....not otherwise was it possible to raise again unto life that which had fallen into death, unless the Only-Begotten Word of God became man, and it was wholly needful that made man he

---

[32] Athanasius of Alexandria, *Contra Arianos*, III, Ch 29, 57. Here I follow the Hanson's translation in *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1988) 424.

[33] Scholars such as Thomas Torrance, *Theology in Reconciliation*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976) 215-266 and Charles C. Twombly, "The Nature of Christ's Humanity: A Study in Athanasius" *The Patristic and Byzantine Review*, 8 (1989): 227-241.

[34] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.4, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 387; *In Joannem*, v.1, 490-491)

[35] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.4, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 388; *In Joannem*, v.1, 492) Cyril quotes Ps 32: 7.

should suffer..."[36] In the eyes of Cyril, his interlocutor's objection fails because it cannot account for salvation.

R.P.C. Hanson claimed that the "Arians" gave a cosmological[37] answer to the soteriological question of how God could suffer. The problem for the "Arians" according to Hanson was how to square an impassible God with the biblical message that God suffered.[38] The "Arians" were convinced that the only way to resolve this problem was to think in terms of several related but unequal grades of the Divine. In this scheme the higher God, the Father, remained impassible while the lower God, the Logos, was mutable and therefore capable of suffering. While some scholars[39] have disputed Hanson's claim that a suffering God was at the heart of the "Arian" gospel, few scholars have rejected Hanson's point that the "Arians" placed the mediating activity of the Logos in his divinity. In Hanson's estimation, Athanasius refused the "Arian" problem as a false one and located the mediating work of the Logos, not solely in his divinity but in his incarnate state. Indeed, as C. Kannengiesser[40] has pointed out, Athanasius refused the religious cosmology of his day and taught that the starting point of Christian faith was the historical event of salvation in Christ rather than the divine origins of the universe or even God as such.

However, Athanasius was not always able to do justice to the suffering of the incarnate Logos. We saw above that in his interpretation of Matt 26:39 Athanasius had particular difficulty attributing real psychic suffering to Christ. If Hanson is correct, Athanasius was not much interested in the suffering of Christ.[41] Whatever the merits of this view of Athanasius might be, Hanson is surely right to point out

---

[36] Cyril, *Commentary on* John, Bk.4, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 392; *In Joannem*, v.1, 497)

[37] By Cosmological I mean a philosophical view of God and the universe which does not locate its starting point in the historical revelation in Jesus the Christ. The *a priori* of such a philosophical view of the divine and of universe is not the historically revealed Trinity but some other god or gods known from philosophical speculation.

[38] R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God,* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988) 425-426.

[39] Rowan Williams has been critical of Hanson in this regard. See "R.P.C. Hanson's Search for the Christian Doctrine of God", *Scottish Journal of Theology,* 45 (1992), 101-111. Williams argues that the extant Arian texts do not show much of an interest in emphasizing the inner sufferings of Christ.

[40] Charles Kannengiesser, "Athanasius and the Foundations of Christology." *Theological Studies* 34 (March 1973), 112.

[41] Hanson, *Christian Search for the Doctrine of God,* 426; 449f.

that the fact that Athanasius located the mediating work of the Logos in his incarnate state was revolutionary for the religious thinking of his day.[42] Because Athanasius saw the incarnate Logos, rather than a concept of God known apart from the historical revelation, as the starting point of Christian faith he was able to smash what A. Lovejoy[43] has called the great chain of being: the ancient Greek supposition that the gap between the divine and human could be closed by adding enough intermediate levels. In the thought of Athanasius, there existed no grades of the divine. On the contrary, for Athanasius the divine and human meet only because of a free and loving act of God. Cyril of Alexandria inherited this insight, and did not merely repeat it but deepened it.[44] The Athanasian insight is more profoundly realized in Cyril's *Commentary on John*. This occurs when he attributes the suffering of Christ, described by scripture in such passage, as Matt 26:39, to the human will of Christ. Cyril was able to begin to address the problem, left over from the "Arian" crisis, that so vexed Athanasius: how can it be that God who entered human history underwent human suffering. Cyril took the soteriological concern of Athanasius, which taught that God must become flesh in order to give humanity incorruptibility and immortality, and gave it a depth not attained by Athanasius.

One conclusion is inescapable: a description of the younger Cyril's christology as a Logos-Sarx type that supposes that Cyril understood *sarx* as referring to inanimate flesh is inaccurate. Grillmeier's description of Cyril's christology before the Nestorian controversy as that of merely a "verbal Logos-Sarx" christology[45] cannot account for the early Cyril's understanding of Christ which recognizes a tension between the divine and human will of Christ. The Logos-Sarx framework is surpassed in Alexandria far sooner than Grillmeier claims. The soul of Christ is clearly a Christological and soteriological factor in the thought of Cyril *before the Nestorian crisis.*

---

[42] Ibid., 424.

[43] Arthur Lovejoy, *The great chain of being: a study of the history of an idea.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971).

[44] Thomas Torrance has noticed this too. He claims that Cyril strengthened the Athanasian Christology in view of his profound understanding of the human mediatorship of Christ. See Torrance, *Reconciliation in Theology,* 158.

[45] Grillmeier, *Christ In Christian Tradition*, 417.

2) The Limitations of Cyril's Thought on the Soul of Christ

It must be acknowledged that Cyril did not completely realize and think out the implications of attributing a human psychology and a human will to Christ. The Alexandrian bishop had great difficulty with passages from the scriptures that speak of Christ as being ignorant. While he can claim in assertio 22 of his *Thesaurus* that Christ bore all that was proper to our nature including ignorance,[46] Cyril goes on to describe the ignorance of Christ in terms of appearance. In assertio 22 Cyril explains that Christ only put on the fashion or appearance of ignorance when he professed ignorance about the last day. Cyril gives the same explanation in regard to the questions put by Christ to his followers "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" and, "How many loaves do you have?"[47] Commenting on John 1:38 Cyril claims that Christ did not ask his disciples questions out of ignorance for he could not be ignorant.[48] Even in his later thought Cyril spoke of Christ's ignorance in this way in his *Apologia xii anathematisimorum contra Theodoretum.* There Cyril wrote that it belonged to Christ both to know and to *seem not to know* (τὸ ειδέναι και μὲν τοι καί *το μή ειδέναι δουκεὶν*).[49] Cyril also found it difficult to interpret Luke 2:52 where it is said that Jesus grew in grace and wisdom. Throughout his writings, Cyril consistently interpreted this passage to mean that Word concealed himself and gradually revealed and manifested his wisdom to those around him.[50]

Cyril wanted hold on to the claim that the Son truly emptied himself out into fallen humanity, fully accepting its limitations. At the same time Cyril wanted to insist that the Son did not cease being divine by taking the form of a slave. At times, Cyril had difficulty upholding these two emphases. The ignorance of Christ and the growth in grace in wisdom are good examples of Cyril's difficulty. It did not occur to Cyril that the problem of Christ's human ignorance and the increase in wisdom and grace is located in the context of Christ's human soul.

[46] Cyril, *Thesaurus,*assertio 22(P.G. 75, 369)

[47] Cyril, *Thesaurus,* assertio 22 (P.G. 75, 373-376)

[48] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.2, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 149; *In Joannem,* v. 1, 193)

[49] Cyril, *Apologia xii anathematisimorum contra Theodoretum,* (A.C.O. I, I, 6, p.124)

[50] On this see the *Thesaurus* assertio 28 (PG 75, 428A); *Oratio ad Pulcherium et Eudocuiam augustas de fide,* 16 (A.C.O. I, I, 5, p.33); *Libri V contra Nestorium,* Bk. 3 (A.C.O. I, I, 6, p.70); *Quod unus sit Christus,* 452f (ed. Durand, Sources chrétiennes, v.97).

Nevertheless, this weakness in Cyril's thought should not be overemphasized.[51] It is significant that he even saw the problem of the consciousness of Christ. Twentieth century theologians are still vexed by this problem and it is too demanding to expect a fifth century theologian to have solved it satisfactorily.

3) Cyril's Later Thoughts on the Soul of Christ.

The recognition of the soteriological import of the soul of Christ does not come to an end in Cyril's *Commentary on John.* On the contrary, there are extant two letters which show that the Alexandrian bishop continued to deepen his insights. These letters are the *De recta fide ad Theodosium*[52] and *Oratio ad Pulcherium et Eudociam augustas de fide.*[53] Cyril wrote both letters 430 in the middle of the Nestorian crisis and before Ephesus. In *Oratio ad Pulcherium et Eudociam augustas de fide,* Cyril clearly speaks about the passions of the soul of Christ. He cites three passages of scripture which seem to refer to the soul of Christ: John 12:27-28, Matt 26:37-39 and Luke 23:46. These passages in Cyril's eyes speak of the sufferings proper to the human soul of Christ. Here Cyril says he argues against the view of Apollinarius, who taught that the Logos took a temple that was soulless and mindless. He wrote:

> On the contrary, when it is a question of the rational soul, everyone agrees that it suffers these passions. By the mind it examines not only present things but also things which are going to come. How then could Emmanuel have said: "Now my soul is troubled?" How could he feel sadness and anguish? And what indeed could have been the spirit (πνεῦμα) which he commended into the hands of God the Father, since these things fit neither the divinity nor inanimate flesh itself. *It is therefore wholly evident that the only begotten Son has become man in taking on a body (σῶμα), not without a soul or mind, but on the contrary, a body animated by a rational soul and having the perfection of what comes to it by nature.* And just as he has made his own all bodily properties, just so he made his own, all those of the soul ... Thus, just as according to the economy he granted to his body to suffer on occasion what comes to it, just so he granted to his soul to suffer what is proper to it. And everywhere he maintained the measure of the

[51] It would be an over-simplification to say that Cyril had difficulty with the issue of the ignorance of Christ because he is of the Alexandrian school. Maurice Wiles has pointed out that Theodore of Mopsuestia was not anxious to impute ignorance to Christ. See his *Spiritual Gospel,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960) at 142.

[52] Cyril, *De recta fide ad Theodosium,* A.C.O. I, I, I, 42-72.

[53] Cyril, *Oratio ad Pulcherium et Eudocuiam augustas de fide,* A.C.O. I, I, 5, 26-61.

> kenosis, without ceasing to be by nature God, and raised above all creation. Likewise, when he commends his own spirit to God the Father, it is a matter of the soul which is united to him, and by that his intention is again to communicate his blessings.[54]

In a passage in his *De recta fide ad Theodosium,* Cyril argues against those who deny that Christ possessed a rational soul and claimed that a human soul would lead to two Sons, two Christs. First, Cyril derides them for separating themselves from the apostolic tradition and then repeats his basic position that the Logos united himself to a humanity like ours and that Christ is one and the same. He then argues against the Docetists and upholds the true humanity of the Logos who became human in order to deliver us from corruption. The Logos according Cyril took a human soul in order to subdue sin. Cyril goes on to reflect upon the death of Christ and his descent into hell. He insists again upon the full humanity of Christ and claims that Word through his body and soul underwent the full range of human experiences: hunger, weariness, terror, fear, anxiety, agony and death on the cross.[55] Cyril continues on to say that Christ laid down his own soul for our soul, "in order to be the Lord of the living and the dead," and that Christ's soul was offered as ransom for our souls.[56] It was the soul of Christ that descended into hell, preached to the imprisoned spirits and bestowed the power of the divine sovereignty over hell. Cyril quotes 1 Peter 3:17-20 and concludes that the passage must refer to the soul of the Logos.[57] There is no room in the thought of Cyril for the idea that the divinity separated from the humanity at the death of Christ.

C) Conclusion

To my knowledge, after the letter to Theodosius and the letter to the Princesses, Cyril's thoughts on the subject of Christ's soul do not undergo any further development. With G.M. Durand[58] one can ask if the Nestorian crisis helped Cyril to sharpen his thought on the soul of Christ or whether the crisis arrested the development of his thought on this issue. It may well be true that the Nestorian

[54] Cyril, *Oratio ad Pulcherium et Eudocuiam augustas de fide,* 44, A.C.O. I, I, 5, p.58-9) English translation is mine. Emphasis mine.

[55] Cyril, *De recta fide ad Theodosium,* 21 (A.C.O. I, I, I, p.55)

[56] Ibid, (A.C.O. I, I, I, p. 54-5)

[57] Ibid, 22 (A.C.O. I, I, I, p.56)

[58] G.M. Durand, *Deux dialogues Christologique,* Sources chrétiennes, v. 97, 113.

controversy, which saw Cyril accused of Apollinarianism, may have contributed to an increase in the depth of his position. While Cyril undoubtedly continued to develop his understanding of the soul of Christ in his letters to Theodosius and to Pulcheria and Eudocia it would be inaccurate to see the material in these letters as a bolt out of the blue. One cannot assign Cyril's recognition of the soteriological import of the soul of Christ simply to the Cyril of the Nestorian crisis. Cyril's thought as found in his letters to the royal family is not a sudden realization on the part of Cyril, but the fruition of his earlier thought.

We have seen in this chapter that a Logos-sarx description of Cyril's christology cannot account for Cyril's biblical understanding of the term *sarx* nor can it explain Cyril's affirmation of the soul of Christ as an active principle of Christ's human action. Moreover, Cyril's biblical conception of *sarx* has little to do with anthropology that sees human nature as spirit trapped in a body. This chapter has also suggested that Cyril's early christology as well as his soteriological concerns are expressed and developed in the thought, language and categories of the scriptures. It remains for us to explore how Cyril does this in his longest biblical commentary, the *Commentary on John.* It is there that the inter-relationship between Cyril's christology, soteriology and eucharistic theology is most evident.

Chapter Three: The Son Emptied Out and the Second Adam

Cyril's primary emphasis in his *Commentary on John* is upon the historical immanence of the Logos in history as the bringer of salvation and the subject of worship. Jaroslav Pelikan writes: "It is clear from the commentary of Cyril on the Gospel of John and from his other treatments of the Gospel material that, even in the course of the theological polemic about the pre-human Logos, he concentrated upon the concrete incarnate one as the object of Christian devotion and as the bringer of salvation."[1] To be sure, there are passages in the *Commentary on John* where Cyril polemicizes against the "Arians" and speaks of the pre-human Logos. In the first few books of the *Commentary on John* Cyril is specifically engaged in a polemic against the "Arians" concerning the divinity of the preexistent Son while in the remaining books the polemic begins to fade and his attention is focused mainly upon the historical Christ. In his Commentary on the Gospel according to the fourth evangelist Cyril explicates the immanence of the Logos in history in terms of the kenosis of the Son of God and in terms of the second Adam. These are the two fundamental christological categories that Cyril uses in the *Commentary on John.* Cyril usually holds both categories together in close unity and he often uses them to explain a particular passage of scripture. The second Adam is always the Son who emptied himself out. The historical kenosis of

[1] Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600),* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971) 249.

the Son relies upon the unity of the second Adam. In other words, Cyril's use of the second Adam title is also of way of expressing that there is no division between the Son and his flesh. When the Son emptied himself out into flesh he made that flesh his own.

The Christological hymn of Philippians 2: 5-9 functions as Cyril's "canon within the canon." He uses it in a variety of different ways. In reference to the baptism of Christ he uses it in order to defend the historical nature of salvation and the Son's entrance into human history by his self-emptying into fallen human flesh which needs the Spirit. It is used to explain how it can be said that the Son of God was given authority over all flesh, how he can pray, and how he can be regarded as our high priest who offered himself as a spotless sacrifice to the Father.

For Cyril, the high point of the historical kenosis of the Son, who is the second Adam, is the sacrifice on the cross. The kenosis is ordered to the cross and one who sees Christ sees the cross. At the death of Christ the mystery of salvation was completely unveiled. The divine mysteries were completely revealed because the death of Christ was the total revelation of his person. For Cyril the prime locus for the interpretation of scripture is here. Christ is the interpreter of scripture primarily in this act in which he fulfills his mission. It is in this act that the shadows of the Law are illumined, transcended and the meaning of salvation history is revealed. In Cyril's mind, the second Adam is always the new head of the redeemed human race. Cyril regards this "heading up in the second Adam" (*anakephalaiosis*) as a way of explicating the incarnation. He spells this out in his comments on John 14:20. Furthermore, for Cyril, the second Adam's headship is always in relation to the body, a body which is caused by the eucharist. The eucharist unites all the baptized into the one body of Christ and the second Adam is the head of this body, this new creation. Thus Cyril expounds his concept of the headship of the second Adam in a eucharistic context. In other words, in Cyril's soteriology, the headship of the second Adam cannot be disassociated from the eucharist. Therefore, given that Cyril regards the headship of the second Adam as a way of explaining the incarnation, the close connection between Cyril's understanding of the eucharist and Christology is evident.

The Christology found in Cyril's exegesis also reveals his soteriological point of departure: the healing of the historical corruption of fallen humanity through the event of the *Logos sarx egeneto* as crucified and risen and giver of the

Spirit. Cyril has a profound understanding of one of the most central affirmations of the Nicene Creed: for us the Son became man and gave up his life. When Cyril speaks of the Son becoming man he most often means that the Son becomes man in the condition of *sarx* rather than man considered abstractly apart from this condition. He never tires of repeating that Christ is like us in all things except for sin.

A) The Kenosis and the Second Adam: Two Fundamental Christological Categories

1) John 1:14

I have already examined part of this passage to show that when Cyril speaks of *sarx* he does not mean mere corporeality but rather the fallen human condition in its totality. Cyril goes on to interpret the meaning of the words "and dwelt among us." Here according to Cyril, the fourth Evangelist reiterates and expands upon his affirmation "the Word was made flesh" in order that he might be better understood. Cyril's initial comments reject the idea that the evangelist meant that the Word was somehow transformed into flesh. The bishop of Alexandria then goes right to the heart of the matter. He writes:

> But profitably does he affirm that the Word dwelt in us, unveiling to us this deep mystery also: for we were all in Christ, and the common humanity (κοινῶν ἀνθρωπότητος) ascends unto his person; since therefore was he named the last Adam, enriching to the common nature all things that belong to joy and glory, while first Adam impoverished our nature with corruption and dejection. The Word then dwelt in all through one that the one being declared the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, the dignity might come unto all the human nature and thus because of one of us ... Therefore in Christ truly is the bond made free, mounting up into the mystic union with him who bore the form of a servant; yet in us after the likeness of the one because of the relation of the flesh ... Is it not clear to all, that he descended unto the condition of bondage, not himself giving thereby ought to himself, but bestowing himself on us, that we through his poverty might be rich, and, soaring up through the likeness to him unto his own special good, might be made gods and children of God through faith?[2]

It is certainly clear from this passage, as Wilken urges, that the Adamic typology is used by Cyril to show that Christ is one with humanity. Christ here is a

---

[2] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk. 1, Ch. 9 (tr. Pusey v.1, 110-111; *In Joannem*, v.1, 141)

concrete individual. But there is more to this passage than simply our solidarity in Christ. Cyril describes the Word made flesh in terms of the second Adam and then in the language of the kenosis. He uses the words of Phil 2:7 and 2 Cor 8:9. He links the second Adam to our solidarity with this second Adam, and to the kenosis. Christ, the second Adam, is the Son emptied out in the form of slave in order that humanity might be made rich. When Cyril explains the enfleshment of the Word he does not do so in terms such as union according to hypostasis. Nor is his problem concerned over how to relate the Logos to his humanity. He clearly turns to the historical economy of salvation to explain the incarnation. This emphasis occurs frequently in the *Commentary on John* and it is not surprising that it makes its appearance again in Cyril's comments on the baptism of the Lord.

2) John 1:32-33: The Baptism of the Lord

Wilken has called attention to the fact that the narrative account of the baptism of Jesus posed a challenge to the early church. How is it that Jesus the Lord can receive the Spirit? In Wilken's estimation Cyril used an Adamic typology to interpret this passage in order to give expression to the belief that Christ was God and one with the Father and yet true man.[3] While Cyril does use the Adamic typology to speak of Christ as both God and man, this typology is not remote from his emphasis upon the kenosis. Once again Cyril is intent upon showing that the eternal Son who emptied himself out proved that he was the second Adam.

Cyril's commentary upon the baptism of Jesus as found in John 1:31-32 begins as polemic against the "heretics". The "heretics", of course, used this passage of scripture to argue that it proved the Son was inferior to the Father because it showed that the Son needed to be sanctified. Cyril answers the "heretics" by citing Phil 2:5-8 and says that the Son was always co-equal with the Father and that at the time of his incarnation he received the Spirit and was sanctified. Christ was sanctified not because he was inferior to the Father but because he humbled himself by emptying himself out. Cyril continues to press the point; he cites Phil 2:5-8 yet again and says that if Christ did not receive the Spirit as man then there was no true condescension and no true emptying out of the Son. If the Son became man in order to gain something for himself "... how will he at all be thought

[3] Robert Wilken, "Exegesis and History," *Church History* 34 (1966): 146f.

to have been incarnate for our sakes, who underwent so great a profit in respect for himself?"[4] Cyril then proceeds to quote, against the "heretics", 2 Cor 8:9 ("Rich, for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich") and asks how the Son became poor for us if he was enriched by the Spirit as God.

Wilken interprets Cyril up until this point as simply following the "two times solution" of his master Athanasius: there exists a distinction between those words spoken about the Son before the incarnation and those words spoken after his incarnation. In the eyes of Wilken it is only after Cyril proposes the traditional solution of his master that he then goes off on a direction all his own by using the Adamic typology to explain the text.[5] But there appears to be more to Cyril's initial comments than simply the "two times" explanation. It is perhaps true that Cyril does expound the traditional solution against the "heretics" but his citations of Phil 2:5-8 and 2 Cor 8:9, which form the superstructure of his argument, show that he is doing something more. Cyril is defending the true kenosis of the Son and hence the historical nature of salvation. If the Son, insofar as he is divine, is in need of sanctification then he cannot truly stoop down and empty himself. The "heretics" claim that the inferior Son needs a sanctifier denies the *homoousion* of the Father and the Son and hence the very possibility of the kenosis. In the hands of the "heretics" the Son is not emptied out in the form of a slave but filled up with riches. The claim of the "heretics" is refused because it cannot account for the Son who is immanent in human history.This is why Cyril's response to the "heretics" is couched in the language of the texts from Philippians and 2 Corinthians. This emphasis must be kept in mind when later in this passage Cyril uses the Adam typology to explain the text. If the second part of Cyril's interpretation is read in the light of the kenotic emphasis of the first part, then it becomes clear that Cyril not only uses the Adamic typology to speak of Christ as true God and true man but he also uses it to express the idea that the Son who emptied himself out is the second Adam.

Cyril begins the second part of his interpretation of the baptism of Jesus by recalling the creation and fall of Adam and the loss of the Spirit. God however took pity on Adam and sought to transform humanity into the divine image

[4] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 2, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 140; *In Joannem,* v.1, 181)

[5] Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind,* 133f.

through the Spirit. Cyril then begins to use the Adam typology to explain the text. He writes:

> Since then the first Adam preserved not the grace given him of God, God the Father was minded to send us from heaven the second Adam. For he sends in our likeness his own Son who is by nature without variableness or change, and wholly unknowing of sin, that as by the disobedience of the first, we became subject to divine wrath, so through the obedience of the second, we might both escape the curse, and its evils might come to nothing. But when the Word of God became man, he received the Spirit from the Father as one of us, (not receiving ought for himself individually, for he was the giver of the Spirit); but that he who knew no sin, might, by receiving it as man preserve it to our nature, and might again root in us the grace which had left us ...For it had fled from us by reason of sin, but he who knew no sin, became one of us that the Spirit might be accustomed to abide in us, having no occasion of departure or withdrawal in him.[6]

Wilken noticed that Cyril makes several points in this passage. First, Cyril uses the motif of the second Adam to speak of Christ as both God and man. The second Adam is the Son of God for he is sent to us from heaven in our likeness. This is the first time in the *Commentary on John* that Cyril has used the second Adam as a way of speaking about Christ as God. It is through his obedience, in contrast to the disobedience of the first Adam, that humanity is released from the curse. Cyril is saying here that the second Adam is a man but he is more than mere man; he is the Son of God and is able to do what an ordinary man could not do. It is because he is a man that he can receive the Spirit for our sakes even though as God he possesses the Spirit. This leads Cyril to say in another passage that the Son receives his own Spirit in order to sanctify his own flesh.[7]

The reception of the Spirit by the second Adam also involves, as Wilken notices, the renewal of humanity. The Spirit is given to the second Adam who is sinless and who will not lose the Spirit as the first Adam did. It is also clear from this passage that just as the deeds of the first Adam were of universal significance for all humanity so too are the deeds of the second Adam who enables humanity to have a new beginning. "Therefore through himself he receives the Spirit for us, and renews to our nature, the ancient good."[8] Cyril's interpretation of the baptism of Jesus continues:

---

[6] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.2 Ch. 1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 142; *In Joannem,* v.1, 184).

[7] See his comments on John 17: 18-19 in the *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch. 10 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 540; *In Joannem,* v.2, 724).

> For thus he is also said for our sakes to be poor. For being rich, as God and lacking no good thing, he became man lacking all things, to whom it is said somewhere and that very well, What have you that you did not receive? As then, being by nature life, he died in the flesh for our sakes, that he might overcome death for us, and raise up our whole human nature together with himself (for we were all in him, in that he was made man). So does he also receive the Spirit for our sakes, that he may sanctify our whole nature. For he came not to profit himself, but to be to all us the door and the beginning and the way of the heavenly goods. For if he had not pleased to receive, as man, or to suffer too, as one of us, how could anyone show that he humbled himself? Or how would the form of a servant have been fittingly kept, if nothing befitting a servant were written of him.?[9]

Wilken points out that Cyril's language of image and symbol here allows him to speak of Christ in an "apparently contradictory fashion"[10] when it is said that the Son who is life died in the flesh. In other words, Cyril here affirms the communication of idioms. While it its true that Cyril makes this affirmation, it is necessary to point out that here the object of this paradox is not the relation of the divinity of the second Adam to his humanity. The object of the paradox is historical. The emphasis is upon the historical unity of the one and the same Christ. It is the Son of God who dies in the flesh. It should be pointed out here that it is not untrue to say that for Cyril the second Adam is in need of renewal not because he has sinned, nor because he is man, but because as man he is in the condition of *sarx* - fallen humanity. To destroy death and the power of *sarx* he must die and rise from the dead. Secondly, there is something else in this passage that is significant. The reception of the Spirit by Christ is clearly connected to the kenosis. Cyril once again (for the fourth time in this passage) uses the language of 2 Cor 8:9 and Phil 2:8. This is confirms the thesis that Cyril firmly connects the Adamic typology to the Son's self-emptying. The Son who is emptied out for our sakes is the second Adam who receives the Spirit.

To sum up: In Cyril's interpretation of John 1:32-33 the kenotic typology and the Adamic typology condition one another. Cyril uses the kenosis to explain the historical events in the life of Christ who is the second Adam. The kenosis of the Son, which is the emptying out into fallen humanity, and who as fallen, as *sarx*, needs the Spirit, is the second Adam who is always the one and the same Christ

---

[8] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.2, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 142; *In Joannem*, v.1, 184)

[9] Ibid.

[10] Wilken, *Exegesis and History*, 150.

Cyril ends his interpretation of the baptism of Christ by distinguishing the possession of the Spirit by John the Baptist and by the Son of God. John is said to have possessed the Spirit by adoption while the Son always possessed his Spirit. At the time of the incarnation and during his baptism the Son received his own Spirit as man in order that all humanity might be sanctified. "... so having in himself essentially his own Spirit, he is said to receive it as man, preserving to the humanity the order befitting it, and with it appropriating for our sakes the things befitting it."[11]

Cyril addresses the issue of the descent of the Spirit again in his comments upon John 7:39. Christ as the giver of the Spirit is an important theme for Cyril. He points out that the Spirit which was lost by Adam is regained by the death and resurrection of the second Adam who will never lose the Spirit. Through Christ the Spirit dwells in us permanently. But how is it, if Christ received the Spirit at his baptism, that the fourth evangelist can write that the Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified? The answer in Cyril's mind lies in the fact that Christ had not yet died and risen. He writes:

> For in that first one, (Adam) the human race proceeds from not being, and having come forth decayed, because it had broken the divine law: in the second, Christ, it rises up again unto a second beginning, re-formed unto newness of life and unto a newness of life and unto a return to incorruption, for it ought to be in Christ, a new creature as Paul says. Therefore has been given to us the renewing Spirit, that is, the Holy, the occasion of everlasting life that after Christ was glorified: after the resurrection, when having burst the bonds of death and appeared superior to all corruption, he lived again having our whole nature in himself ... And if you investigate the reason why not before the resurrection but after it did the pouring forth of the Spirit take place, you will hear in reply, Christ became then the first fruits of the renewed nature, when making none account of the bands of death he lived again as we have just now said.[12]

Through the sacrifice on the cross the risen Christ gives the gift of the Spirit of Christ. Here Cyril anticipates his later comments in which he claims that the passion is the high point and glory of the kenosis. The kenosis leads to the new creation and the gift of the Spirit. The full and complete habitation of the Holy Spirit is not given until Christ has been glorified in his death and resurrection. It is this death and resurrection which institutes the new creation. The Adamic

[11] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.2, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 145; *In Joannem,* v.2, 188)

[12] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.5, Ch.2 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 549; *In Joannem,* v.1, 694)

typology functions here to show that Christ, the second Adam, and as Cyril often says, the second root, institutes this new creation.

3) The Glory of Christ.

Before I explore any further Cyril's development of his Christology in terms of the Adamic typology and the kenosis, it is necessary to examine Cyril's concept of the glory of Christ. Cyril's thought on this subject also underwent a development which had important implications for his fundamental Christological categories of the second Adam and the historical kenosis of the eternal Son. This brief discussion is necessary in order to understand the context of the development of Cyril's thought. Here I simply wish to avoid the mistake of assuming that an important theme articulated by Cyril in his works prior to the *Commentary on John* are simply repeated in that work and have not undergone any significant development.

In the early 1960's the French Jesuit Augustin La Tour[13] wrote two important articles which examined Cyril's understanding of glory of Christ. His research was mainly restricted to Cyril's earlier works and did not include the *Commentary on John*. He showed that for Cyril, glory (δόξα) is an attribute which pertains to the divinity of Christ.[14] The permanence of Christ's glory is the permanence of his divinity. La Tour argues that there is an emphasis in Cyril's thought upon the flesh as veiling the divine glory and at the same time the idea that the flesh is an instrument for revealing the divine glory.

The French Jesuit noticed that, in the works prior to the *Commentary on John,* Cyril makes a distinction between δόξα and εὔκλεια.[15] The latter term refers to an increase of the radiance of glory in the kenotic condition of the Son. There is a progression only of εὔκλεια in Christ. It is only the kenotic radiance of the divine glory which can be said to vary and increase in Christ rather than the divine glory itself. For if the divine glory itself ceased to be in the kenosis then Christ would cease being divine. La Tour also noticed the importance of the Christological schema of Phil 2: 6-11 for Cyril's exegesis. He observed that it is from this

[13] Augustin La Tour, "La Doxa Du Christ Dans Saint Cyrille," *Recherches de science religeuse* 38 (1960) 520-42. (Hereafter referred to as "La Doxa Du Christ," pt.1.) "La Doxa Du Christ Dans Cyrille," 39 (1961) 69-94. (Hereafter referred to as "La Doxa Du Christ, " pt.2)

[14] La Tour,"La Doxa Du Christ," pt.1, 525.

[15] Ibid., 540. La Tour cites *Glaphyra in Genesim*, (Bk.7 (P.G. 69, 376D-377A)

schema that Cyril "developpe le mouvement de l'économie charnelle du Verbe."[16] He argued that Cyril reversed the Christological movement of the hymn of Philippians. In other words, the Philippians text states that though Jesus was God he took the form of a slave, while Cyril claimed that though the Son was made flesh he was not without his glory. La Tour thought that there is a real tension in Cyril's thought here. On the one hand the the bishop of Alexandria wanted to uphold the self-emptying of the Son and yet on the other hand he wanted to firmly maintain that the Son is never without his glory. It is La Tour's opinion that because Cyril cannot distinguish between nature and person he always maintained a priority of the divine.

For Cyril, according to La Tour, the existence of δόξα during the kenosis of the Son manifests itself in words and signs. The miracles worked by Christ, the curing of the sick, the exorcism of evil spirits, and the raising of the dead are seen as manifestations of the divine δόξα. These manifestations throw light upon the obscurity of the kenosis and are small theophanies which show that Christ is truly the Son of God and God by nature. In La Tour's estimation the glory of Christ in this regard is not directly interpreted in the context of the kenosis. Rather it is interpreted in the sense of an attribute of the God who is the Lord of all creation. The glory of the divinity that shines forth in the miracles worked by Christ manifest the supremacy of the power of the divine.

La Tour contended that in Cyril's eyes the economy of salvation is the divine work par excellence. Thus the economy manifests and makes known the glory of Christ and this glory is achieved finally in the kenosis. It is the entire life of Christ who was both humbled and risen that constitutes the revelation of his glory, which is ordered to universal salvation. La Tour argued, rightly, that for Cyril salvation appears under two aspects, positive and negative, which are complementary. The positive aspect consists in the gift of justification and adoptive sonship, while the negative aspect comprises the liberation from sin, ignorance, and death. Both aspects reveal the same glory. Thus La Tour wrote "La δόξα est en ce sens l'attribut du triomphateur et consacre sa suprématie sur les forces du mal: le Christ est le victorieux. Considérée positivement, la gloire du Christ est source de vie pour tous, elle se manifeste dans notre sanctification dans son sang."[17]

[16] Ibid., 530.

[17] La Tour, "La Doxa Du Christ," pt 2, 84.

La Tour noticed that Cyril knows of a τίμιος (glorious in the sense of honorable) cross which expresses the relation between the theme of glory and the theme of the cross. In La Tour's view Cyril understood the cross in a theophanic sense. The cross of salvation is the τίμιος cross. La Tour cited the following passage taken from Cyril's *Commentary on Isaiah:*

> The Savior of the world, our Lord Jesus Christ, has been glorified through having endured being slaughtered for the sake of the world and in freely undergoing death for the life of all. Hence he says to his heavenly Father, when about to go to his honorable (τίμιος) cross "Father, glorify your Son, so that your Son glorifies you ..." For as to the degree that one shares the folly of those who crucified him and their unholy and odious undertaking, his passion was a disgrace and αδόξια. They probably also think that he had not suffered freely. However, since he showed himself greater than death we shall find that it results in honor and glory for him.[18]

La Tour argued that one can see the movement of themes in this passage as follows. The death of Christ is both the source of life for humans and the victory over the forces of sin and death. In this the divine glory is manifested but not fully. In the resurrection there is the full manifestation and blossoming forth of the glory hidden in the death of Christ. In this sense the death of Christ is a theophany. For Cyril the passion is a sign of δόξα. This sign is discovered in the fact that Christ chose willingly to undergo the sacrifice on the cross. Thus the cross is termed the τίμιος cross because it is sign of glory rather than the very reality of glory itself. The cross is the first moment of a theophany which is fully realized and manifested in the resurrection. The resurrection fully manifests the divine power of Christ, that which conquers sin and death. Thus, in the eyes of La Tour, Cyril regards the cross not as the revelation of the lowering (abaissement) of Christ but of his triumph. La Tour is convinced that Cyril in the final analysis is faithful to the biblical understanding of δόξα which sees glory as a theophany and a visible exterior manifestation of divinity. In support of this argument La Tour concluded his study by citing a passage in the *Thesaurus* where Cyril specifically spells out the meaning of δόξα by interpreting John 17:5. In this passage Cyril begins by noting that δόξα in the profane tradition can mean τίμη which signifies honor. But δόξα can also mean γνῶσις. Cyril argues that we must understand δόξα as in a manner analogous to this meaning in John 17:5. He writes:

---

[18] Cyril, *In Isaiam,* Bk.2 Ch. 1 (P.G. 70, 328B). Translation mine.

> When the Son is discovered saying Father glorify me with the glory I had before the world was. It must be understood in an analogous way. Since he says, I have become man according to the economy, and it is only through me that one sees this, and they have no knowledge of me being the pre-existent (προαιώνιος) Son, glorify me, (δόξασόν με) that is to say manifest me, (φανεπωόν με) give to men a knowledge about my subject, in such a way that they might understand and that might learn that I existed before the world was, God by nature, light of light, truth proceeding from the Father of truth. Through this, much will we understand. Glorify me, that is to say reveal me (φανεορόν με) since I have revealed your name to men. If therefore he wishes that realization which he did himself - now he has glorified the Father - he wishes himself to be glorified in being revealed to men by the Father. And it is vain for the enemies of Christ to say that the Son is in need of δόξα and of τίμη.[19]

La Tour is interested in this passage because it shows that Cyril understood δόξα according to the biblical tradition. For Cyril, in this passage, glory has to do with the manifestation and revelation of the divine. Thus the glorified Christ gives to humanity an authentic knowledge. Cyril understands glory then as a theophany which affects in the spirit of men a knowledge of the divine.

La Tour's two articles mark an important beginning in the study of Cyril's concept of the δόξα of Christ. I have noted that La Tour's research did not include any discussion of Cyril's developing concept of glory in the *Commentary on John.* If careful attention is given to that commentary it becomes clear that Cyril's understanding of the glory [δόξα] of Christ has matured and undergone a free development.

4) The Passion of Christ as Glorious

The development in Cyril's thought on the glory of Christ first surfaces in his comments on John 13:31-32 and reaches a crescendo in his comments on the priestly prayer of John 17. Commenting on John 13:31-32 he links the passion to glory in a different way. John 17:5 is no longer interpreted as a plea from Christ to the Father to reveal him as the pre-existent Son.[20] Cyril now says that Christ prayed in this way in order to reveal and make manifest the incarnation to his disciples. The Alexandrian bishop does not reverse the movement of the Christological schema in the Philippians hymn *but employs it to explain how it is that Christ*

[19] Cyril, *Thesaurus,* assertio 30 (P.G. 75, 440 B-D) The English translation is mine. See La Tour's citation in "La Doxa Du Christ," pt.2, at 93.

[20] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 11, Ch.6 (tr. T. Randall, *Commentary on John,* v.2, 491; *In Joannem,* v.2, 376-380)

can pray to the Father to be glorified. The cross is now the high point of the Son's self-emptying. R. Wilken was the first scholar to perceive this development in Cyril's understanding of glory. His observations, which are important, are limited to Cyril's comments upon John 13:31-32. "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God glorified in him; and God shall glorify him in himself, and straightway shall he glorify him." Specifically, Wilken noticed that this text raised perplexing questions for Alexandrian Christology. It is one never cited by Athanasius.[21]

Cyril begins his remarks on John 13:31-32 stating that Christ's words show that he is referring to his approaching sufferings. Against unnamed Christological dualists he argues that the title "Son of man" here refers to the one and same Christ and does not imply any separation. He rejects any solution that would suggest that the text means that Christ will be given a glory that is greater than the glory which he possesses as God. How is it that Christ says at this particular point that he is glorified when many of his previous works clearly manifested his glory? Cyril insists that the glory referred to here is greater than the glory of the miracles worked by Christ. The Alexandrian urges that the passage means that Christ is glorified as man:

> ... still the perfect consummation of his glory (δόξα) and the fullness of his fame were summed up in the facts of his suffering for the life of the world and[fashioning a new way (καινοτομῆσαι) through his resurrection for the resurrection ofall.] For if we examine as well as we may the real character of the mystery of his work, we shall see that he died, not merely for himself, nor even especially for his own sake; but that it was on behalf of humanity that he suffered and carried out both the suffering in itself and the resurrection that followed. For in that he died according to the flesh, he offered up his own life as an equivalent for the life of all; and by rendering perfect satisfaction for the life of all, he fulfilled in himself to the utmost the force of the ancient curse. And in that he has risen again from the dead to a life imperishable and unceasing, in himself he raises the whole of nature ... But still, when the form of a servant had been assumed, for as much as he raised himself to those conditions again, even after he had become man, he is conceived as being glorified and is said to have received.[22]

Here, as Wilken points out, Cyril explicitly connects suffering to glory. Christ's passion itself is said to be glorious. Cyril says here that through suffering Christ opens up a new way for humanity because the passion leads to death and resurrection. Wilken argues that Cyril tries to integrate the idea of suffering

[21] Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind,* 185f.

[22] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.9 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 209-211; *In Joannem,* v.2, 378)

associated with glory into his thought by relying upon the biblical theme of new creation. Thus the new way arises from the suffering and death of Christ.[23] According to Wilken it follows from this text, as well as from others, that the goal of the incarnation in Cyril's thought should not be interpreted without reference to the death and resurrection.[24] To this I would add that Cyril's connection of the passion to glory is within the greater context of the new creation and has not simply been forced by John 13:31-32 but is part of the over-arching category of the headship under the second Adam. We will see that for Cyril this headship has profound eucharistic implications.

Secondly, the cross is no longer a sign of glory, as Cyril earlier thought, but it is now seen historically i.e. as glorious in its own right. Essentially, Cyril has drawn the cross and the resurrection closer together than he had in his earlier writings. There does not appear in this passage the idea of the cross as the first moment of a two stage-theophany. M. Wiles[25] is correct in his observation that this text shows that Cyril regarded the cross and resurrection basically as one action.

Having seen that Cyril's understanding of glory underwent a development, I am now in a position to examine in some detail Cyril's comments upon the priestly prayer in John 17. I will explore Cyril's further development of the Adamic typology and the historical kenosis. I have mentioned above that Cyril's understanding of glory reaches a crescendo here. I will pay particular attention to this development and show how his understanding of the glory of Christ has implications for his fundamental Christological categories.

5) The Kenosis and the Second Adam in Cyril's Interpretation of the Priestly Prayer of Christ

Cyril's comments upon the priestly prayer (John 17:1-26) must be read as a unified whole. His interpretation has a beginning, middle and end. From the very outset of his interpretation of the priestly prayer and throughout it, Cyril frequently refers to the kenosis of the Son. This theme provides a basis for his

[23] Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind,* 186.

[24] Ibid., 184.

[25] Maurice Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) 84. Wiles recognizes this point but he does not claim, that this marks a development in Cyril's thought.

interpretation of Christ's prayer for glory. As Cyril continues his interpretation of the priestly prayer, it becomes clear that the apex of the kenosis is located in the sacrifice of the cross. The cross of Christ, the apex of the historical kenosis of the Son, together with the resurrection overcomes the corrupting power of the flesh and destroys death. This new life is mediated through the eucharist whereby believers are united in Christ's life-giving body. The Son who emptied himself out and died on the cross is always the second Adam who unites humanity under his headship. I maintained in the last chapter that Athanasius had insisted that the starting point of Christian faith was the historical event of salvation in Christ. I argued that Cyril did not simply repeat this insight but deepened it. If Cyril's comments upon the priestly prayer are compared with those of Athanasius then Cyril's contribution is striking. Unlike that of Athanasius, his interpretation goes well beyond explaining the text in the face of "Arian" objections to the equality of the Father and the Son.

It should be noted at this point that Athanasius did not comment upon the entire priestly prayer. His comments in the *Contra Arianos* begin with John 17:3 and are concerned with showing that the Son reveals the Father. Athanasius, unlike Cyril, does not consider (avoids?) Christ's prayer for glory (John 17:4-5). He comments upon the first prayer for unity (John 17:11) and on John 17:18-19 (I sanctify myself...). I will compare Cyril and Athanasius as they bear upon these points. First, it is necessary to turn to Cyril's comments on John 17:1-2.

a) John 17:1-3

Cyril's initial comments on the priestly prayer explain how the Son can pray and ask the Father to glorify him. While Cyril is still insistent upon saying that in his divinity Christ is not deprived of glory, nevertheless he goes further:

> ....but since being in the form of God, and in perfect equality with him, he counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but nevertheless descended into the lowliness which is ours, he emptied himself bearing this ignoble body; and from love putting on the likeness of human littleness now that the fitting time had actually arrived, at which he was destined, after fulfilling the mystery of our redemption, to gird himself about with his pristine and essential glory; having wrought out the salvation of the whole world...[26]

[26] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.3 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 480; *In Joannem,* v.2, 660)

Clearly, Cyril interprets the passage from the viewpoint of the historical kenosis. Here he cannot be accused of inverting the "Christological movement" of the language of the Philippians hymn. Cyril simply says here that Christ did not cease being God by emptying himself into the ignoble body. He goes on to say that the Son ascended into heaven in the flesh. Cyril does write later in the passage that "the Son spoke these words to show how very necessary his own glory was to the Father, that he might be known to be consubstantial with him." But he does not interpret Christ's words as a plea to the Father to reveal him as the preexistent Son; rather he reads these words as referring to the Son in the flesh.

The reliance upon kenosis to interpret the words of Christ continues in Cyril's analysis of the next verse "Even as you gave him authority over all flesh, that whatsoever you have given him, to them he shall give eternal life". Cyril teaches that Christ prays for us and is a high priest because he is true man. But he is a high priest who is sinless and offers himself as a blameless sacrifice to the Father. Cyril cites Heb 4:15 "For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities; but one that has been in all points tempted like as we are; yet without sin."As high priest Christ, who is in the condition of the flesh, offers himself as a spotless sacrifice to the Father, purifies humanity in his blood, and renews humanity by his Spirit. It is against this background that Cyril argues that authority over all flesh must be explained. He then goes on to explain this authority in the terms of the kenosis. Because the Son lowered himself and took the form of a slave it is possible to say that he received authority over all flesh. Anything that Christ received he received as man. We must not be astonished by such things, Cyril urges, because the Son underwent a voluntary subjection to the will of the Father.

The Alexandrian patriarch then begins to connect the priestly prayer to the eucharist in his interpretation of John 17:3: "And this is life eternal, that they might know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent." At the beginning of his interpretation, Cyril makes the point that knowledge only comes by faith. This true knowledge of God will keep those who have it in a state of sanctification and incorruption. For Cyril all this raises questions. He rules out the idea that Christ's words meant that a mere intellectual knowledge would bestow eternal life. He cites three texts from scripture to support his argument Jas 2:24 "faith apart from works is dead," Isa 8: "If you do not believe neither will

you understand" and Jas 2:19 "You believe that God is one; you do well: the devils also believe and shudder." He then writes:

> I think that we must answer that the saying of the Savior is wholly true. For this knowledge is life, pregnant with the whole power of the mystery, and vouchsafing unto us participation in the eucharist, (μυστικης εὐλογίας) whereby we are [united] to the life giving Word. And for this reason I think, Paul says that the Gentiles are made "fellow members of the body and fellow partakers of Christ; in as much as they partake in his blessed body and blood; and our members may in this sense be conceived of, as being members of Christ. This knowledge then, which also brings to us the eucharist by the Spirit, is life.[27]

This is not the first time that Cyril has linked the knowledge of God to the eucharist. Interpreting John 9:6-7 Cyril writes: "It was not otherwise possible for the gentiles to thrust off the blindness which affect them, and to behold the divine and holy light, that is, to receive the knowledge of the holy and consubstantial Trinity, except by being made partakers of his holy body ..."[28] Cyril expands on this point in his interpretation of John 17:3. The knowledge of God is eternal life because it is pregnant with the things of eternal life. It leads to the eucharist. It is in the eucharist that believers are joined, in the Spirit, to Christ. This eucharistic emphasis will be deepened and further developed in Cyril's later comments on John 17 and will reach a climax in his interpretation of John 17:18-21.

6) John 17:4-5

Cyril then turns his attention to the problem raised by John 17:4-5 where Christ asks the Father to glorify him. The Alexandrian bishop prefaces his remarks by contending that the Savior's speech refers to the one Christ who is divine and human. Christ's words refer both to his divinity and humanity. For he sought to teach his disciples not only that he was God but also that he became man. Here Cyril distinguishes the divine and human in Christ while at the same time upholding Christ's unity albeit in language that is not precise.[29] I have

---

[27] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.5 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 489; *In Joannem,* v.2, 669) It should be pointed out that Cyril usually uses the words μυστικης εὐλογίας when he refers to the eucharist.

[28] Ibid. Cyril's remarks here are within the larger context of his interpretation of the curing of the man born blind. Cyril insists that this miracle is a sign of Christ's mission to the gentiles and that it is sign that Savior is the creator of the universe.

[29] Cyril speaks here of the person of Christ in terms of mixture and interweaving:
"ΑΗΑΠΛΕΚΕΙ παλιν τω θεοπρεπεῖ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, καὶ μεμικταὶ

mentioned that in the *Thesaurus,* assertio 30, Cyril interpreted John 17:4-5 as Christ's asking the Father to reveal him as the pre-existent Son. Cyril could have repeated that interpretation here but he does not. Now Christ's words refer to the time of his coming in the flesh. Christ does not ask the Father for glory as God but rather as man:

> For though in the fullest sense, as he was God of God the Father, he was invested with divine glory, still, in the time of the economy for us he contracted it (συνέστειλέ πως αὐτὴν)taking upon himself this ignoble (αδοξότατον) body, he with reason seeks it as though he had it not speaking the words as man.[30]

Then Cyril immediately refers to the kenosis and quotes Phil 2:5-11. He continues on and writes:

> For though the Son is high in as much as he proceeded as God and Lord from the Father, nonetheless is the Father recorded to have exalted man in him, for on man the degradation of his nature brings the need of exaltation. He prays then for the recovery in his own glory even in the flesh. He is not wholly deprived of his own glory when he so speaks, even though he were to ask without receiving, for the Word, being the true God, was never robbed of his own majesty.[31]

Now there is an unresolved tension in all this that Cyril has not fully worked out. On the one hand Cyril still takes great pains to say that Christ is not wholly deprived of glory "for the ineffable nature of God is complete." On the other hand Cyril wants to say that in so far as the Son has truly become *sarx* he needs to be exalted and glorified. To the extent that Cyril says this, Christ's prayer for glory is a prayer for the new creation where sin and death are conquered by the cross and the resurrection. For Cyril also insists in this passage that Christ glorified the Father through his work which saved the whole world and raised up the fallen human race anew "to endless life and true knowledge of God." Despite any element of unresolved tension, there is a real development of Cyril's thought. Cyril does not reverse the Christological movement of the Philippians hymn. He employs the kenosis to explain how the Son can pray to the Father for glory. The bishop Alexandria interprets the passage as referring to the incarnate Son, not to the preexistent, Son. An interpretation of the passage as a prayer for Christ to be revealed

Cyril avoids this sort language during and after the Nestorian crisis. Here he is intent upon affirming both the unity of Christ and the distinction between the humanity and divinity of Christ rather than an Apollinarian mix.

30 Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.6 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 496;*In Joannem,* v.2, 677)

31 Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.6 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 497; *In Joannem,* v.2, 677)

as the pre-existent Son would not fit Cyril's emphases up to this point. It would not fit his association of the passion with glory in John 13:38. Secondly, such an interpretation would not fit the eucharistic context which Cyril uses as an overarching framework to interpret the priestly prayer. If Cyril is intent upon saying that the new creation in Christ is mediated through the eucharist, then an interpretation that sees Christ praying to be revealed as the pre-existent Son will not advance this eucharistic emphasis. Again, this emphasis, which as I have noted, first emerges in his comments on John 17:3, will be fully developed in his interpretation of John 17:18-21.

c) John 17:6-8

Cyril's insistence that Christ makes his prayer as God and as man continues in his comments on the next three verses of the priestly prayer John 17:6-8. According to Cyril, when Christ said that he manifested the name of the Father to all men he used the word "name" in place of glory. The patriarch of Alexandria writes:

> The Savior therefore plainly declares that he has manifested the name of God the Father; that is, he has established his own glory throughout the whole world. And how? Clearly by the manifestation of himself, through his great works.[32]

Here again it is obvious that for Cyril the work of Christ is not somehow absorbed by his person or by the hypostatic union. The person of Christ is only "grasped" if one's eyes are opened to his work. This point must be kept in mind when Cyril goes on to make the point that Christ revealed the originator of the world to be not only God but is also the Father. In Cyril's estimation the name Father is a greater name than the name God which is only a symbol of his majesty. On the other hand, the name Father explains "the indispensable attribute of his person," defines his individuality, and indicates the fact that he begets the Son. Christ did not say that I and God are one but the Father and I are one. Christ reveals something that the law of Moses, which only knew the Father as the sovereign God, could not reveal. Christ reveals the Father through his prayer, his actions and his mighty deeds. Again in Cyril's eyes the person of Christ is inseparable from the work of Christ. For the work of Christ shows who Christ is and in

---

32 Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.7 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 499; *In Joannem,* v.2, 680)

knowing Christ we know who the Father is. Thus the work of Christ is indispensable and without it we would know not Christ or the Father.

The next problem that Cyril takes up has to do with how to understand the words of Christ, when he prayed "Now they know that all things whatsoever you have given to me are from you. For the words which you have given me I have given to them." How can the Son, who is co-equal with the Father, be said to be given something which he did not already have? Cyril gives his usual solution: the Son receives from the Father as man. He writes:

> Our savior then speaks, at the same time, in his character as God, and in his character as man. For he was at once God and man, speaking in either character without reproach, suiting each occasion with appropriate words as it required.[33]

d) John 17:9-11b

Cyril moves on to consider the meaning of Christ's prayer for his disciples (John 17:9-11b). At this point he begins further to explore a connection that he has spoken of earlier: the nexus between the priestly prayer and the sacrifice on the cross. In his prayer to the Father, Christ is said to mediate as man. Christ, whom Cyril calls the reconciler, mediator and the lamb who takes away sin, shows himself to be both high priest and spotless victim who "appeases the anger of his Father, sacrificing himself for us."[34] Throughout his reflections upon the sacrifice of Christ his emphasis is not upon an angry Father whose anger cries out for appeasement. This passage is one of the very few where Cyril uses this metaphor.

The mediation of Christ is clearly connected to his sacrifice. This mediation was typified by the Mosaic ceremonial and "the high priest of the law indicated in his own person that priest who is above the law." Cyril does not hesitate to make the point that Christ is the truth of the types that foreshadowed his sacrifice. Christ is able to mediate for us as man because he is sinless and has no need of sacrifice. The Alexandrian bishop continues his emphasis upon the distinction between the

[33] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.7 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 505; *In Joannem*, v.2, 687)

[34] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.8 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 506; In Joannem, v.2, 688). William Malley, *Hellenism and Christianity,* at 326 has noticed that in *Contra Julianum* Cyril says that the predication of anger or jealousy to God does not disclose passions within the Godhead but rather reveals the power of God's love for humanity. See *Contra Julianum,* Bk.5, (P.G. 76, 748C)

divine and human in the one Christ when he argues that as man Christ prays for us and as God he distributes the blessings of his mediation.

At this point Cyril speaks of these blessings of mediation in general terms: fellowship with the Trinity. Later in his comments upon John 17:17-19 he spells these blessing out in greater detail. We have here an indication of the way in which Cyril will interpret the meaning of the words "I sanctify Myself.." in John 17:19. We will see that these words are interpreted in reference to the sacrifice of Christ. In his comments upon John 17:9-11b this emphasis upon interpreting the priestly prayer in reference to the sacrifice of Christ begins to take shape. Cyril ends his reflections upon this passage by asserting yet again that Christ's words show the identity of substance between the Father and the Son. "For they are yours and all things that are mine is yours and yours are mine..."

Cyril deals at some length with the meaning of John 17:11b "Holy Father, keep them in your name which you have given me that they may be one." We know from Athanasius that the "Arians" used this text to argue that the Son was inferior to the Father. They argued from this passage that just as we become one with the Father so too does the Son become one with the Father. Athanasius replied by arguing that we become sons by adoption while the Son is God by nature. He wrote in *Contra Arianos* III,:

> For as, although there be one Son by nature, true and only-begotten, we too become sons, not as he in nature and truth, but according to the grace of him who calls, and though we are men from the earth, are yet called not as the gods, true God and his Word, but as has pleased God who has given us that grace ... For he [John] does not say, that, as the Son is in the Father, such we become - how could it be? When He is God's Word and Wisdom, and we were fashioned out of the earth ...[35]

Cyril certainly knows of his master's interpretation of this text but his emphasis is different. His interpretation, unlike Athanasius is not set in the context of the "Arian" objection. Cyril begins his interpretation by insisting again, for the third time, that Christ makes his prayer as God and as man. Christ speaks as man when he asks the Father to keep the disciples in the name that the Father has given him. He repeats his emphasis that through his kenosis the Son humbled himself to accept the limitations of fallen humanity but did not thereby cease being God. It is

[35] Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, III, Ch.. 15, 19. (tr. J.H. Newman and Archibald Robinson, *The Select Library of the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff, v.4, (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1892; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 404.

only because he humbled himself and underwent humiliation that we can be called sons of God "to whose likeness we are conformed by participation in the Spirit."

There is an echo here of Athanasius' interpretation but the shape and scope are different. Cyril without doubt felt obligated to give some acknowledgement to his master's comments on this passage. This he does by arguing that we are sons of God by the grace of the Spirit while Christ is God by nature. But Cyril differs from Athanasius in that he situates this point in the context of the kenosis. Cyril then strikes out on a course all his own. He interprets Christ's prayer that the disciples might all be one by referring it humanity's corporeal and spiritual unity in Chirst and the Spirit. According to Cyril, Christ desired that his disciples "be kept in unity of mind and purpose, being blended, as it were, with one another in soul and spirit and the bond of brotherly love."[36] This unity, given by the Spirit, is so perfect that it resembles the unity between Christ and the Father. Secondly, according to Cyril the unity that Christ prayed for is both corporeal and spirtual:

> And this is what Paul himself meant when he said: "One body and one spirit; for we who are many are one body in Christ for we all partake of one bread, and have received the anointing of the one Spirit, that is the Spirit of Christ. As, then, they were to be one body, and to partake of the one selfsame Spirit."

For Cyril Christ's prayer for unity looks forward to that unity that is given in the Spirit and the eucharist. In this way he goes beyond the interpretation he received from Athanasius.

e) John 17:12-17

In his comments upon John 17:12, the Alexandrian bishop for the most part repeats what he has maintained in his earlier remarks. The words of Christ show both his divinity and humanity. Christ kept and protected his disciples even after he departed from them in the flesh. Cyril then feels obligated to explain that Judas, the son of perdition, fell away by his own free will from the protection and mercy of Christ. Often enough Cyril will break way from his main discussion and chase down minor problems raised by the text.

Cyril resumes his discussion in his comments upon John 17:13: "And these things I speak in the world, that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves." He continues to press his point that by his words Christ was "showing himself

[36] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch. 9 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 514; *In Joannem,* v.2, 698)

then to them at the same time both as God and as man."The bishop of Alexandria goes on to claim that Christ wished for the disciples to understand that "even when he was in the flesh, it was not through the flesh that he was working for their salvation, but in the omnipotent glory and might of his Godhead."[37] The statement must be interpreted in its context. Cyril is simply intent upon saying here that Christ is not mere man. His concern is for the eucharist, for he goes on to say that the body of the Lord was sanctified and made life-giving by the power of the Word; thus the eucharist is life-giving because it is the body of the Word. The emphasis upon the unity of Christ is here unmistakable. Cyril continues:

> We give this explanation, not as making of no account the holy body of Christ, may it not be so, but because it were more fitting that the accomplishment of his Word should be ascribed to the glory of the Godhead. For even the body itself of the [Lord] was sanctified by the power of the Word made one with it, and it is thus endowed with life giving force in the eucharist ... Therefore also our [savior] himself, once conversing with the Jews, and speaking many things concerning his own body, calling it the true bread of life, said: "The bread which I will live you is my flesh for the life of the world."[John 6:51] And when they were sore and amazed and perplexed to know how the nature of earthly flesh could be to them the channel of eternal life, he answered and said: "it is the spirit which gives life; the flesh is useless; the words I spoke to you are spirit and life." For here, too, he says that the flesh is useless, that is, to sanctify and quicken those who receive it, so far, that is, as it is mere human flesh; but when it is understood and believed to be the temple of the Word, then surely it will be a channel of sanctification and life, but not altogether of itself, but through God, who has been made one with it, who is holy and life.[38]

Cyril's eucharistic emphasis is striking. If the flesh of Christ is not the flesh of the Logos, the only-begotten Son, then the eucharist does not have the power to give life. The unity of Christ is indispensable. Cyril deepens the eucharistic emphasis that he first raised in his comments on John 17:11. He will return to it again in his comments upon John 17:20-21. Cyril ends his reflection upon this passage by stating that the joy that Christ prays to be fulfilled in the disciples has to do with the knowledge that Christ is not mere man. But it must be kept in mind that this knowledge has eucharistic implications for Cyril. Commenting upon John 17:14-17 Cyril indulges in his fondness for repetition. He speaks in some detail of the world's hatred for the disciples of Christ and claims that Christ prays for

---

[37] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 11, Ch.9 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 523; *In Joannem,* v.2, 706)

[38] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 11, Ch.9 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 523; *In Joannem,* v.2, 706-707)

their protection against Satan in order that they might stay in the world to complete their apostleship and their call to holiness. Cyril's most important comments upon this part of the priestly prayer are found in his interpretation of John 17:17: "Holy Father, keep them in truth, your word is truth." In Cyril's mind Christ prays that his disciples be "led by the revelation of truth". The Alexandrian bishop immediately adds that no one comes to knowledge of the truth apart from the Spirit. Cyril sees Christ praying for an outpouring of the Spirit which cannot occur, as he will maintain in the following passage, until Christ has suffered, died and been raised from the dead. Cyril concludes his reflections by making the point that:

> And all men are holy, whoever are seen to be unspotted by the world, and whatsoever are by nature in Christ, in the Father's likeness adopted, and chosen to be his disciples by the sanctification according to grace, and the light and goodness of their lives.[39]

According to Cyril then, Christ prays for the Spirit to come upon the disciples so that they might be conformed to his image and to the likeness of the Father. This unity, however, as he goes to explain his interpretation of John 17:20-21, is eucharistic.

f) John 17:18-19

For Cyril this passage in particular marks the high point of the signs of Christ's forthcoming passion. "As you did send me into the world, even so I sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth." He interprets Christ's words "I sanctify myself" in reference to both his sacrifice and the outpouring of the Spirit. Cyril again goes beyond Athanasius who against the "Arians" interpreted this passage in reference solely to Christ's reception of the Spirit. Athanasius wrote:

> And signifying this the Lord himself has said by his own mouth in the gospel according to John "I have sent them into world, and for their sakes do I sanctify myself, that they may be sanctified in truth." In saying this he has shown that he is not the sanctified, but the sanctifier; for he is not sanctified by other, but himself sanctifies himself, that we may be sanctified in truth. He who sanctifies himself is Lord of sanctification. How then does this take place? What does he mean but this? I, being the Father's Word, I give myself, when becoming man, the Spirit; and myself, become man, do I sanctify in him, that henceforth in me, who am Truth (for Your Word is truth), all may be sanctified. If then for our sake he sanctifies himself, and does this when he became man, it is very plain that the

[39] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk. 11, Ch.9 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 531-532; *In Joannem*, v.2, 716)

> Spirit's descent on him in the Jordan was a descent upon us, because of his bearing our body. And it did not take place for promotion to the Word, but again to our sanctification, that we might share in his anointing ... For when the Lord was washed in the Jordan, it was we who were washed in him and by him. And when he received the Spirit, we it was who by him were made recipients of it.[40]

Cyril is able to enrich Athanasius's interpretation and yet do so in a way that suits his own emphasis. He is not preoccupied with interpreting this passage against the "Arians". Perhaps he avoids saying with Athanasius that the descent of the Spirit upon Christ in the Jordan is the descent of the Spirit upon us because he has already said in his comments upon John 7:39 that the Spirit was not given to the disciples until Christ had died and risen. For Cyril the Spirit is given to the disciples through the sacrifice, death, and resurrection of Christ. He begins by saying that Christ's words show that the disciples need to sanctified "by the holy Father who implants in them the Holy Spirit through the Son." Cyril goes on to say that this was accomplished when Christ rose from the dead and breathed upon the disciples the Spirit which had been lost through the sin of Adam. The divine image was restored to the human race and humanity was renewed. Cyril also maintains at this point in his interpretation that the Spirit is not given through the Son as if the Son were merely a servant of the Father. On the contrary, the Son is consubstantial with the Father and "the Spirit of the Father is indeed the Spirit of the Son."

Cyril then takes up the meaning "I sanctify myself". What does it mean to sanctify? He claims that according to the Law that which is offered up to God and is holy to him is said to be sanctified. He cites by way of example Exodus 13:2: "sanctify unto me all the firstborn, whatsoever opens the womb". This sanctification according to the law is not sanctification in the Spirit. Only God can sanctify in the Spirit. We learn what sanctification according to the law means from Solomon, in Prov 22:25 "It is a snare to a man hastily to sanctify anything that is his, for after he has made his vow repentance comes." Sanctification has to do with offering and setting apart and it is in this way that the Son sanctified himself for our sakes. For the Son offered himself as a spotless sacrifice and victim to the Father. This sacrifice, insists Cyril, brings us into kinship with the Father who reconciles

[40] Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, I, Ch.12, 46. (tr. J.H. Newman and Archibald Robinson, *The Select Library of the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff, v.4, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 333.

the world unto himself because it puts the human race into communion with the Spirit.

For Cyril the sacrifice of Christ and communion in the Spirit are closely linked. In the Spirit we become partakers of the divine nature and sons of God. Citing John 6:13 and Gal 4:6 Cyril argues we are only in God through the communion of the Spirit. But the Spirit only comes to us through the Son and his sacrifice to the Father. Cyril writes:

> How, then, should we have had added to us, or how should we have been shown to be partakers in divine nature, if God had not been in us, nor we been joined to him through having been called to communion with the Spirit ... For the only begotten sanctified himself for our sins; that is offered himself up, and brought himself as a holy sacrifice for a sweet smelling savor to God the Father ... For in him (Christ) the first fruits of the race, the nature of man was wholly reformed into the newness of life, and ascending, as it were to its own first beginning, was molded anew into sanctification.[41]

If Cyril's earlier point in this passage is recalled, that the sacrifices of the old law were powerless to effect sanctification in the Spirit, then the meaning of this passage becomes clear. The sacrifices of the law were unable to affect sanctification in the Spirit for they were always offered by those in need of sacrifice and because the power to sanctify belongs to God alone. But the sacrifice of Christ was the spotless sacrifice of the Son of God who was man and who had no need of sacrifice for himself. It follows for Cyril then that the sacrifice of the Son in the flesh affected sanctification in the Spirit. Thus the human race is created anew. The unity of Christ is indispensable here: if the sacrifice of Christ is not the sacrifice of the Son of God there can be no sanctification in the Spirit.

Cyril does not fail to connect these remarks to his emphasis upon the idea that the Son who emptied himself out is the second Adam. He says that it can be asked in what sense Christ was sanctified. He writes:

> We say, then that the only begotten, *being by nature God, and in the form of God the Father, and in equality with him, emptied himself according to scripture, and became man born of a woman,* receiving all the properties of man's nature, sin only excepted, and in unspeakable way uniting himself to our nature by his own free will, in order that he might in himself first, and through himself regenerate it into that glory which it had at the beginning; *and he having proved himself the second Adam, that is the heavenly man,* and being found first of all, and the first

[41] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 11, Ch.10 (tr. T. Randall v.2, 538; *In Joannem,* v.2, 722-723)

> fruits of those who are built up into newness of life, in incorruption that is, and in righteousness and the sanctification which is through the Spirit, He might henceforth through himself send good gifts to the whole race. For this cause, though he is life by nature, he became as one dead; that, having destroyed the power of death in us, he might mold us anew into his own life; and being himself the righteousness of God the Father, he became sin for us.[42]

Here Cyril's Christological categories of the kenosis of the Son and the second Adam clearly and concretely converge. Furthermore it is apparent that the extreme point of the Son's self emptying is his sacrifice and death on the cross. But for Cyril the Son who emptied himself is always the second Adam who destroys death by his death and resurrection and gives the Spirit to all humanity. The second Adam is clearly the new Head of the human race which has been sanctified in the Spirit. Cyril continues on to say that the Son received his own Spirit and sanctified his own flesh and thus partook of his own Spirit insofar as he was man.

> Since, then, the flesh is not of itself holy, it was therefore sanctified, even in the case of Christ -- the Word that dwelt sanctifying his own temple through the Holy Spirit, and changing it into a living instrument of his own nature.[43]

Cyril also says that Christ in his obedience to the Father accomplished the works of redemption in order that the sanctification of the Spirit and the blessings of salvation might be given to the whole human race. The advance beyond Athanasius in this whole passage is unmistakable. John 17:17-18 in Cyril's eyes does not simply refer to Christ's reception of the Spirit. It refers primarily to the cross. The texts we have examined clearly show that for Cyril the historical kenosis of the Son is ordered to the Son's sacrifice on the cross and together with the resurrection brings about sanctification in the Spirit and institutes the new creation. For Christ is the second Adam, the heavenly man, in whom the human race has a new beginning.

Cyril's remarks upon this part of the priestly prayer of Christ are perfectly in line with his comments elsewhere in the *Commentary on John* on the redemptive work of Christ. At this point I shall interrupt my discussion of Cyril's interpretation of the priestly prayer and consider other key texts where he comments upon the sacrifice, death and resurrection of Christ in the *Commentary on John.* I will

---

[42] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 11, Ch.10 (tr. T. Randall v.2, 539; *In Joannem,* v.2, 724) Emphasis mine.

[43] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 11, Ch.10 (tr. T. Randall, v.2 541-542; *In Joannem,* v.2, 726)

show in particular that Cyril consistently interprets the death and resurrection of Christ in the context of the kenosis of the Son and the second Adam.

6) The Death and Resurrection of the Son Emptied Out who is the Second Adam

a) John 13:34,36

In John 13:34 Christ gives his disciples a new commandment. ("A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another as I have loved you; that you may also love one another ") Cyril turns his attention to the word "new" and takes the opportunity to speak of the new beginning in Christ. He cites 2 Cor 5:17 as a key text concerning the newness brought about by the death and resurrection of Christ: "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things have passed away; behold all things have become new." Cyril sees this newness of life that Christ gives to humanity in the context of Christ transforming the types of the Old Testament into the truth of the New Testament. He writes:

> For Christ does renew us, and fashions us again into newness of life which is unknown to and untraveled by the rest of mankind, who love to regulate their lives by the Law, and remain constant to the precepts given by Moses.[44]

Cyril goes on to say that the Law was not useless but was a tutor for the Gospel and that it foreshadowed the newness to be given by Christ. But how, Cyril asks, did the new commandment, given by Christ, to love one another as he loved us, differ from the commandment of the Law which bound us to love God with all our heart and mind and our neighbor as ourselves? For Cyril the answer lies in Christ's love for us. It is Christ's love for us that accounts for the novelty of Christ's commandment. For Christ loved us more than we loved ourselves, and the utter novelty of his love is shown by his kenosis and death on the cross. Cyril cites Phil 2:6-8 and then immediately refers to Christ's suffering and death on the cross:

> For whereas the Law enjoined the necessity of loving our brethren as ourselves, our Lord Jesus the Christ on the other hand loved us far more than he loved himself. Else he would have never descended to our humiliation from his original

[44] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 9, Introduction (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 216; *In Joannem,* v.2, 384)

exaltation in the form of God the Father, nor would he have undergone for our sakes the exceeding bitterness of his death in the flesh, nor have submitted to blows from the Jews, to shame, to derision, and all his other sufferings.[45]

The death and resurrection of Christ not only institutes the new beginning in Christ; it also institutes a new ethical demand. As Christ loved us more than himself so we must love our neighbor more than ourselves. This is the new commandment given by Christ that was foreshadowed by the Law. This new commandment, according to Cyril, is a "love that transcends the Law" and "the law of love that is the cornerstone of everything that is good." This text is also important because it shows us that Cyril always sees the enfleshment of the Son and his suffering and death in the context of the historical kenosis. Cyril situates the selfless love of the Son within this kenotic context. The historical person of Christ is always explained by his historical work.

In his comments upon John 13:36 ("Where I am going you cannot follow me now, but you shall follow afterwards.") Cyril continues his emphasis upon the newness that the human race receives from Christ. He argues that the Son was not simply saying here that he was returning to his Father, but that he was returning to his Father as the first fruits of a new humanity:

He was most especially presenting himself to God the Father as the firstfruits of humanity, and although what was being done was to secure the advantage of all mankind: for he restores for us a new way which the human race knew nothing before.[46]

Later in this passage Cyril claims that this newness in Christ has to do with the liberation from death:

Wherefore, in our view at least, even the blessed prophets used to dread the approach of death, when it had not been rendered powerless by the resurrection of Christ ... For the saving passion of Christ is the first means that ever brought release from death, and the resurrection of Christ has become to the saints the beginning of their good courage in meeting it.[47]

Yet Cyril goes on to say that the new life in Christ is given only through the Spirit. This is why the disciples will only follow Christ after he has returned to his

---

[45] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 9, Introduction (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 218; *In Joannem,* v.2, 386)

[46] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 9, Introduction (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 224; *In Joannem,* v.2, 392)

[47] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 9, Introduction (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 225-226; *In Joannem,* v.2, 393)

Father as the first fruits of humanity. Cyril argues here that Christ's words have a double signification. On the one hand Christ means that at that time disciples could not possibly follow him in his return to his Father, while on the other hand Christ means that they cannot follow him because they have not yet received the gift of the Spirit. The Spirit is only given through the death and resurrection of Christ. For Cyril the newness in Christ is never separated from the gift of the Spirit.

In John 14:2 Christ tells his disciples that his Father's house has many mansions and that he goes to prepare a place for them. In his comments upon this passage Cyril continues to develop the idea that the risen Christ offers himself to the Father as the first fruits of the new humanity. The resurrection and ascension are an integral part of Christ's offering himself in our behalf. In Cyril's eyes the sacrifice of Christ was the first sacrifice that penetrated the heavens. He writes:

> For heaven was then utterly inaccessible to mortal man, and no flesh as yet had ever walked upon that pure and all- holy realm of the angels; but Christ was the first who innovates for us the means of access to himself, and granted to flesh a way of entrance into heaven; presenting himself as an offering to God the Father, as it were the first fruits of them that are asleep and are lying in the tomb, and the first of humankind that ever appeared in h eaven.[48]

Cyril means here that the sacrifice of Christ was the only sacrifice offered to the Father that was spotless. Only the unblemished sacrifice of Christ, untainted by sin, was able to overcome the effects of the fall. Through this sacrificial death of Christ the human race has a share in his resurrection. But Cyril's interpretation of John 17:19 must be recalled: only the sacrifice of Christ, who is at once God and man, is capable of affecting sanctification in the Spirit. It is only through that gift that humanity has access to Christ and his sacrifice. Later, Cyril will explain the specific means of this access to Christ in eucharistic terms in his comments on John 17:20-21.

Cyril insists that the risen Christ "who is still one of us" after the resurrection, continues to present himself to the Father on our behalf. In this passage Cyril does not miss the opportunity to continue his emphasis upon Christ as the second Adam. Christ is clearly the new Head of a new human race who presents himself to the Father:

---

[48] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 9, Introduction (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 236; *In Joannem,* v.2, 403)

> And this he has done on our account and for our sakes, in order, that he, though found as a man, may still in his absolute power as Son, while yet in human form, obey the command: "Sit on my right hand", and so may transfer the glory of adoption through himself to all the race ... He has presented himself therefore as man to the Father on our behalf, that so he may restore us, who had been removed from the Father's presence by the ancient transgression, again as it were to behold the Father's face. He sits there in his position as Son, that so through himwe may be called the sons and children of God.[49]

The risen Christ removes the ancient transgression of the first Adam by sending humanity his gift of the Spirit. The second Adam has overcome the corrupting power of *sarx* through his death and resurrection. The accent here is clearly upon the historical work of the second Adam. Cyril does not teach that Christ's saving work took place wholly and only in the act of the becoming flesh.His Christology is historical and as is his soteriology, these are intimately linked and cannot be separated.

b) John 14:20

In his comments upon Christ's words: "In that day you shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you" Cyril's emphasis upon the historical work of the second Adam as the new head of the reconstituted human race is unmistakable. His comments begin as a refutation of the "Arians" but are not restricted to merely refuting their denial of the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son. All the key elements of Cyril's Christology are found here: the kenosis of the Son, the headship of the second Adam who destroys death and corruption by his death and resurrection, and the renewal of the divine image in humanity. The emphasis on the new headship in the second Adam is particularly striking; the word ἀνακεφαλαιώσις appears four times and ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι appears three times in this passage. Cyril explains the incarnation according to the headship of the second Adam.

Cyril's interlocutor argues that the words of Christ in John 14:20 refer to the union between the Father and the Son which is a union only of love. The interlocutor argues further that it was only after Christ rose from the dead that he existed in the Father and in us according to the law of love. Cyril's reply seeks to show that if close attention is paid to the salvific work of Christ then his

[49] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.9, Introduction (tr. T. Randall, v.2,237; *In Joannem,* v.2, 404)

interlocutor's account can be dismissed as false. Cyril admits that it is true that the resurrection brought about the perfection of knowledge concerning the love between the Father and the Son; nevertheless the words of the Father before the resurrection, "This is my beloved Son" (Matt 3:17), must be believed. For they show that the words of Christ in John 14:20 did not refer to some future time when the Son will become one with the Father. On the contrary, they show that the Son was always one with the Father.

Cyril then goes on to cite Phil 2:6-7 and adds a word of his own. In reference to Christ, he says, "for being in the form of God *the Father.*" Cyril adds the word *Father* because he will later argue that only one who is in the image of the Father can restore human nature. He claims that the kenosis of the Son shows that Christ did not mean that he would be one with us at some future time. Cyril argues here that Son was one with us even before the resurrection because he emptied himself into our fallen condition. Furthermore, when Christ spoke of that day when his disciples will be one with him, he simply referred to the hidden day when they, "renovated after his likeness, shall ascend unto eternal life." The day that Christ speaks about refers to the time when he will transform human bodily existence into his glory.

For Cyril Christ is not in the Father according to the "law of love" but according to a "deep mystery" that is difficult to fathom. Only if the aim of the incarnation is considered can it be learned how the Son is in the Father. Christ is able to overcome the corrupting power of the flesh because he is God by nature and is therefore the giver of life. The divinity of the Son and his enfleshment are explained in Cyril's eyes by reference to the redemptive work of Christ.

Cyril begins to examine the aim of the incarnation by citing yet again Phil 2:6-7 but this time he links it with Heb 12:2 "enduring the cross despising the shame". He clearly wishes to assert that the kenosis is ordered to the cross. Cyril then claims that Paul pointed to the cause of the incarnation in Eph 1:10 "for he [the Father] was pleased to head up (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) all things in Christ." The reference to the second Adam here is unmistakable. Next, Cyril says that the *anakephalaiosis* involves the return to the original state. Once again Cyril is intent upon saying that the Son who emptied himself out proved himself to be the second Adam.

Cyril goes on to say that there are two modes (τρόπους) of the *anakephalaiosis* found in Rom 8:3-4[50] and Heb 2:14-15[51] whereby Paul explained the incarnation. The point which Cyril makes here is that both passages not only insist that the Son became flesh, they also refer to the new headship in Christ who is the second Adam. Cyril wants to say that the Son descended into flesh that he might overcome it and conquer death and become the head of a new humanity. But in order to do this Christ must be by nature God and he must also share our fleshly condition.

Cyril also claims that another mode of explaining the incarnation, inclusive of Rom 8:34 and Heb 2:14-15, is given in John 1:11-13, where it is said that Christ makes us children of God, not born of flesh and blood but of the will of God. The work of Christ gives to humanity a newness that only could be brought about if Christ were true God. So Cyril can write:

> So then it is abundantly evident and manifest I think to all, that it was for these causes especially that, being by nature God and of God, the only-begotten has become man; namely with intent to condemn sin in the flesh, and by his death to slay death, and to make us sons of God, regenerating in the Spirit them that are on the earth unto supernatural dignity. For it was, I believe, exceedingly good, after this sort to head up again (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) and to recover unto the ancient state the sore-stumbled human race.[52]

Cyril is not satisfied to end his comments here. He thinks it necessary to explain how can be said in Rom 8:3-4 that the sin was condemned in the flesh by the Father who sent his Son in the likeness of this sinful flesh. Here Cyril returns again to his emphasis upon the second Adam as head of a new humanity. First he insists that the Son voluntarily descended into flesh. The Son was not simply freely obedient to the Father's will in order to liberate the "temple of his own body alone" from corruption but also was obedient to the Father for the purpose of securing and communicating the "first fruits of humanity." For just as we all bore

---

[50] For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. (Rom 8:3-4)

[51] Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, He also himself in the like manner partook of the same; that had the power of death, that is the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. (Heb 2:14-15) Cyril identifies Paul as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[52] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 316; *In Joannem,* v.2, 482)

the image of the earthly in the first man and underwent suffering and corruption in him (Cyril cites 1 Cor 15:49) so too will we bear the image of the heavenly in Christ who "sanctified the nature of the flesh in himself" and thus gives to us the gift of incorruptibility. Cyril declares:

> So then the Word being God by nature condemned sin in his own flesh, by charging it to cease its activity, or rather so amending it as that it should move after the good pleasure of God, and no longer at its own will; and so whereas the body was natural (ψυχικον), he made it spiritual. (πνευματικον) by Christ. This then is one mode of the heading up (ἀνακεφαλαιώσις).[53]

Cyril then fixes his attention upon Heb 2:14-15 which is another mode of explicating the new headship in Christ and is "most befitting and appropriate" for understanding John 14:20. According to Cyril Heb 2:14-15 refers to the fact that the only-begotten Son became flesh in order to conquer death so that humanity might recover the gift that was lost: "partaking once more in God who holds all things together in being and preserves them in life through the Son in the Spirit."[54] Cyril briefly recalls that at the first creation God breathed the Spirit into man who then of his own free will turned away from God and lost the Spirit. But the Father resolved to "head up (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) once more in Christ the nature of man into its ancient state. "It was impossible for humanity to escape death and corruption without recovering the Spirit." So Cyril writes:

> Therefore he has become partaker of blood and flesh, he has become man, being by nature life, and begotten of the life that is by nature life i.e. of God the Father - his only-begotten Word, with the intent that ineffably and inexpressibly and as he alone could do, uniting himself with the flesh that by the law of its own nature was perishing, he might bring it back unto to his own life and make through himself a partaker of God the Father. For he is the mediator between God and man ...having us in himself accordingly as he wears our nature and our body has become entitled the body of the Word. "For the Word was made flesh," according to John. And he wears our nature, remolding it unto his own life. And he is also himself in us; for we have all been made partakers of him, and have him in ourselves through the Spirit; for this cause we have both, being made partakers of the divine nature, and are entitled sons after this sort having in us also the Father himself through the Son.[55]

Cyril then concludes that the words of Christ in John 14:20 refers to the time when the Son will make his disciples partakers of the divine nature by putting the

[53] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 317; *In Joannem*, v.2, 483)

[54] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 320; *In Joannem*, v.2, 485)

[55] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 320; *In Joannem*, v.2, 486)

Spirit in them. Christ puts us in communion with the Father because Christ is by nature one with the Father and we are in Christ only in the Spirit. For Cyril this is nothing less than the renewal of the divine image in humanity. Cyril responds to an "Arian" exegesis of John 14:20 but he is able to go beyond the "Arian" state of the question. His interpretation of John 14:20 is concerned for showing that the union between the Father and the Son is not one of love. Significantly, Cyril does not refute the claim of the "Arians" by speculating about the non-human Logos. For Cyril theis a way of explaining the incarnation. He rebuts the "Arians" by arguing that because Christ is the second Adam, who restores and renews the divine image for humanity, we know that Christ is divine by nature.

c) John 19:30/Matt 27:51

In his interpretation of John 19:30 Cyril is actually more concerned with commenting upon Matt 27:51 than with John's account of the death of Jesus upon the cross. Cyril's exegesis here not only shows the close link he maintains between the person of Christ and his redemptive work; it also demonstrates that he sees the sacrifice of Christ as revealing the full and true meaning of the Old Covenant.[56] Here it should be recalled the point made earlier in this chapter about Cyril's claim that in Christ the types of the Law are transformed into the truth. This claim is not simply grounded by Cyril in the person of Christ but in his sacrifice on the cross. The sacrifice of Christ for Cyril is the standard by which all the symbols and types of the Law have their norm. Cyril's exegetical principle of the transformation of the types into the truth has its source in the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Secondly, if Cyril's claim that "the type shall be transferred to truth and the shadow of the Law to spiritual worship" (John 4:24), and his idea of the transforming death of Christ are taken seriously, then it also follows that the death of Christ is a new form of worship that institutes the worship in spirit and truth.

This point must be remembered when R. Wilken argues that Cyril's interpretation of John 4:24, together with his conviction that Christianity is the result of the transformation of Judaism, constituted an over-arching framework that Cyril

[56] Koen, "Saving Passion", who knows that Cyril did not disassociate the person of Christ from the work of Christ, also recognizes that Cyril uses sacrificial terminology and motifs to express the redemption. See the seventh Chapter of his work. Koen does not comment at length on Cyril's interpretation of John 19:30 and Matt 27:51 nor does he discuss the importance of the sacrifice of Christ as a theological principle which informs Cyril's exegesis.

used to discuss the relationship between the two testaments. The basis of this framework is the sacrifice of Christ because it is only in this act that the full reality of symbols and types of the Law is fully present and complete.

Cyril's comments upon John 19:30 are brief. After asserting that Christ fully underwent death for the sake of all humanity so that he might be Lord of both the living and the dead, and that after his death in the flesh he preached to the spirits in hell, Cyril takes up the meaning of Matt 27:51: "the veil of the temple curtain was torn in two, from the top to the bottom." Now according to Cyril, before the death of Christ the second veil covered the holy of holies because the Law was still in force. The new life given by Christ and the sanctification in the Spirit had not yet come to pass. He sees the Law as a symbol of the vestibule of the temple which led to the second tabernacle of the holy of holies:

> Therefore, also, the Law placed the Jews in the outer court. For the dispensation of the Law was, as it were, a porch and vestibule leading unto the teaching and life of the Gospel. For one is but a type, the other the truth itself.[57]

In the eyes of Cyril the tearing of the temple curtain signified that God was in the act of revealing the holy of holies and hence "the knowledge of the divine mysteries is laid bare." The obscurity of the law no longer hides the divine mysteries. It was with the sufferings and death of Christ on the cross that:

> ... the time had then come that the broad veil, that had so long been spreadout, should henceforth be rent asunder, that is, the protection of the letter of the Law and that the fair vision of the truth should lie bare and open before those who had been sanctified in Christ by faith.[58]

Cyril goes on to say that the tearing of the curtain from top to bottom signified that the revelation of the message of salvation was not partial but perfected. Moreover the tearing of the veil from top to bottom signified:

> ... that the worshippers of the Savior were about to be enriched in all wisdom, and in all knowledge, and in all utterance, manifestly receiving the knowledge of the mystery concerning him, undefiled and unclouded by blot or shadow ... we say, then, that the most appropriate and fitting time for the revelation of the divine mysteries was the occasion on which the Savior laid down his life for us ...[59]

---

57 Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.12, Introduction (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 640; *In Joannem,* v.3, 98)

58 Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.12, Introduction (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 640; *In Joannem,* v.3, 99)

59 Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.12, Introduction (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 642; *In Joannem,* v.3, 100) Emphasis mine.

The meaning of salvation history and the full and true meaning of the Old Covenant are revealed in the passion of Christ. Henri de Lubac has written that the patristic tradition saw Jesus as the interpreter and exegete of scripture above all in the act of his sacrifice on the cross by which he fulfills his mission. By his cross Christ unites the two testaments.[60] Our passage shows that this applies to Cyril in all its vigor.

We have seen that Cyril's comments upon the priestly prayer of Christ emphasized interpreting the sacrifice, death and resurrection of Christ in the context of the kenosis of the Son who is always identified with the second Adam in Cyril's thought. The section has shown that this emphasis on the kenosis and the second Adam is not limited to his comments on the priestly prayer. The kenosis and the second Adam and his headship are fundamental categories he employs when he explains the Christ.

7) The Eucharistic Context of the Kenosis and the Second Adam: John 17:20-21.

At this point I shall resume my discussion of Cyril's interpretation of the priestly prayer and explore the nature and cause of the unity between humanity and the second Adam. We have seen that Cyril's interpretation of Christ's prayer for unity in John 17:11 differs from Athanasius' interpretation in that it is interpreted eucharistically. This emphasis is deepened in his comments upon John 17:20-21. Athanasius commented on this passage in the same way we have seen him interpret John 17:11. The "Arians" used this text to argue that the unity of the Son and the Father was a moral one rather than a consubstantial one. Furthermore humanity can enjoy this same moral unity with the Father. In reply to this claim Athanasius answered:

> And for this reason also the words "that they may be one in us," have a right sense. If, for instance, it were possible for us to become as the Son is in the Father, the words ought to run, that they may be one in you, as the Son is in the Father; but, as it is, he has not said this; but by saying in us he has pointed out the distance and difference; that he indeed is alone in the Father alone, as only Word and Wisdom; but we in the Son, and through him the Father.[61]

[60] Henri de Lubac, tr. Luke O'Neill, *Sources of Revelation* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968) 111-112.

[61] Athanasius, *Contra Arianos,* III, Ch.15, 21. (tr. J.H. Newman and Archibald Robinson, *The*

During the course of his comments on John 17:20-21 Cyril refers to the same "Arian" objection and dismisses it. But his real interest lies in asserting that the unity of the human race with the second Adam is eucharistic. Cyril's initial comments clearly indicate the direction he will take in interpreting this passage from John. After saying that Christ is the first fruits of the newness of life and the heavenly man he immediately alludes to 1 Cor 15:47: "For, as Paul says: The second Adam is the Lord from heaven". Cyril then cites John 3:13: "And no man has ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven even the Son of Man." He then goes on to say that the disciples are closely connected to Christ. But this close connection to Christ has its own order. For Cyril maintains that the disciples of Christ come *after him* because Christ is "the head of the body, the church." Furthermore in Cyril's eyes Christ's prayer for unity is also a prayer to the Father for the descent of the Spirit upon the disciples because "no man can attain to union with God, save by communion with the Holy Spirit.." Once again he claims that the Spirit renews the divine image in whomever he dwells. Cyril does not say this simply for the sake of repetition. It will be the basis upon which he will later explain a spiritual unity of believers.

Next Cyril briefly turns his attention to the "Arian" interpretation of this passage which he quickly rejects as being the product of great ignorance and folly. Here, as in the other passages we have examined, Cyril feels obliged to repeat the interpretation he has inherited from Athanasius before he works out his own interpretation in some detail. Cyril is able to use skillfully the Athanasian interpretation for his own purposes as a kind of springboard for his own interpretation. When Cyril argues for the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son here he also claims the bond between believers resembles this unity. He leaves no doubt that when he speaks of the unity among believers he is referring to the ecclesial body, for he is quick to add:

> He [Christ] desires in us in some sort to be blended with one another in the power that is of the holy and consubstantial Trinity; so that the whole body of the church may be in fact one, ascending in Christ through the fusion and concurrence of two peoples into one perfect whole.[62]

Select Library of the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, ed. Philip Schaff, v.4, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 405.

[62] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.11 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 548; *In Joannem,* v.2, 733) Italics mine.

Cyril sees this as the implication of Eph 2:14-16, which he immediately cites. There the one body is said to have been brought about through the cross. He sees this passage as a reference to the eucharistic unity of the church. This becomes clear when Cyril urges that the cause of this ecclesial unity is the eucharist. Those who partake of it are united with each other and with Christ who is "the bond of union, being at once God and man." Cyril teaches that believers all of the "same body (συσσώμοι) with one another and Christ" and that Christ "is in us through his flesh". He often uses the word to συσσώμοι describe the corporeal union between Christ and the church caused by the eucharist.[63] This word appears three times in this passage. Thus Cyril writes:

> For by one body, that is, his own, blessing through the mystery of the eucharist those who believe on him, he makes us of the same body (συσσώμους) with himself and with each other ... For if we all partake of the one bread, we are all made one body; for Christ cannot suffer severance. Therefore the church has become Christ's body, and we are also individually his members, according to the wisdom of Paul. For we, being all us united to Christ through his holy body, in as much as we have received him who is one and indivisible in our own bodies, owe service of our members to him rather than to ourselves. And that while the Savior is accounted the head (κεφαλην), the church is called the rest of the body, as joined together of Christian members ...[64]

The cause of the unity between Christ, who is the second Adam, and the church is for Cyril clearly eucharistic. Furthermore, the relation between the second Adam and the church as head to body is also an unmistakable emphasis here. Cyril goes on to cite Eph 4:14-16 which asserts this Head-Body relation in support of his claim. One conclusion is inescapable here: Cyril stands in sharp contrast to those who would explicate the cause and unity of the church with Christ in

---

[63] There is no exact English equivalent of συσσώμοι. Thomas Artz in "One in the Body of Christ, Robert Issac Wilberforce and the Theology of Concorporation" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston College, 1986) has pointed out that there is no consensus on a precise translation of the word. Furthermore, the question as to whether the word indicates a term or a theological theme remains a largely unsettled question among translators. Those who view the word as a term translate the word as "concorporate" or as "concorporal" while those who view the word as a theological theme translate the word as "in one body" or "of the same body." The latter is T. Randall's preference which I have chosen to follow because it best expresses the theological point that Cyril makes in this passage. Artz also makes another point germane to our reflections: Athanasius never uses the word to describe the Church's union with Christ. He uses it to explain union with Christ through the incarnation. There are occasions when Cyril uses the word in this sense too, but he uses it most often in reference to the eucharistic union.

[64] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk. 11, Ch. 11, (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 550; *In Joannem*, v.2, 735)

the form of a spiritualizing neo-Platonism. For Cyril teaches that those who partake of the flesh of Christ attain a corporeal unity. The unity of Christ of course is indispensable here for if the flesh of Christ is not the flesh of the Son then it has no power to give life and the church is only united to a mere man. This passage shows that for Cyril salvation is dependent upon both the divinity and the humanity of Christ.

Cyril ends his comments on John 17:20-21 by claiming that in addition to corporeal unity in Christ there also exists a spiritual unity in the Spirit. It will be recalled that Cyril claimed at the beginning of his remarks that Christ's prayer for unity was also a prayer for the gift of the Spirit. Thus Cyril teaches that:

> ... we say once more, that we all, receiving one and the same Spirit, I mean the Holy Spirit, are in some sort blended together with one another and with God. For if, we being many, Christ, who is the Spirit of the Father and his own Spirit, dwells in each one of us severally, still the Spirit is one and indivisible, binding together the dissevered spirits of the individualities of one and all of us, as we have a separate being, in his the Spirit own natural singleness into unity, causing all to be shown forth in him, through himself, and as one. For as the power of the flesh makes those in whom it exists to be of the same body (συσσώμους), so likewise also the indivisible Spirit of God that abides in all, being one, binds all together into unity.[65]

Cyril sees support for his point in Eph 4:2-6. The corporeal unity in Christ and the spiritual unity in the Spirit are closely linked. As we have seen he has consistently maintained that no one is in Christ except through the Spirit. In Cyril's eyes where there is spiritual unity there is corporeal unity and vice versa. He sums this up nicely in his concluding comments on John 17:20-21.

> We are all, therefore, one in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit; one, I mean, according to a certain state of mind and body (for I think we ought not to forget what we said at first); and also in conformity to the life of righteousness, and in the fellowship of the holy flesh of Christ and in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, which is one, as we have just now said.[66]

Cyril's commentary on the remainder of John 17 verses 22-26 for the most part repeat what he has said before. However, there is one text that is particularly important. Commenting on John 17:22-23 and the glory that which Christ says he has received from the Father and which he in turn has given to his disciples, Cyril

---

[65] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 11, Ch.11, (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 551; *In Joannem,* v.2, 736-737)

[66] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 11, (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 552; *In Joannem,* v.2, 737)

sees glory as given through the eucharist and the indwelling of the Spirit. Cyril writes:

> We have, therefore, been made perfect in unity with God the Father, through the mediation of Christ. For by receiving in ourselves, both in a corporeal sense and a spiritual sense, as I said just now, him that is the Son by nature, and who has essential union with the Father, we have been glorified and become partakers in the divine nature of the most high.[67]

We saw in Cyril's interpretation of John 14:20, Christ's sacrifice was the first that "inaugurates for us the means of access to himself, and granted flesh a way of entrance into heaven." For Cyril the descendants of the first Adam could not offer sacrifice that would reach the Father and undo the effects of the Fall because their sacrifice was always tainted by sin. Christ, the second Adam, who is sinless, offers the perfect sacrifice to the Father. Christ presents himself as an offering to the Father and gives the Spirit to his disciples who are united into spiritual unity by this gift of the Spirit. Those who are united into spiritual unity share in the fruits of the sacrifice of Christ because they are united corporeally with Christ, the second Adam, and with each other in the eucharist. It is clear from this passage that the headship of the second Adam is always in relation to the body and the cause of this body is the eucharist. *For Cyril the headship of the second Adam cannot be disassociated from this eucharistic context.*

D) Conclusion

In the last chapter I referred to a presentation of Cyril's Christology as an incarnationalism which sees the redemptive work of Christ as absorbed by a notion of the hypostatic union. We have seen that such a view cannot be reconciled with Cyril's thought as it is found in the *Commentary on John*, which does not express his understanding of Christ in such concepts as union according to hypostasis or even his famous formula *one nature of the incarnate Logos*. The two primary categories of the Christology presented by Cyril's exegesis are the kenosis of the Son of God and the second Adam. In the thought of Cyril the kenosis of the Son and the second Adam are two categories which rely upon one another. Cyril uses the kenosis of the Son to explain historical events in the life of Christ who shows himself to be the second Adam. The kenosis is closely linked to the second Adam

---

[67] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk. 11, (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 554-555; *In Joannem*, v.3, 3)

who is one and the same Christ, true God and true man. Cyril insists that the kenosis is not the transformation or metamorphysis of the Son into flesh. The kenosis is ordered to the cross and one who sees Christ sees his cross. The work of Christ reveals who Christ is and his work cannot be disassociated from his person. In knowing who Christ is one knows who the Father is.

Cyril's profound understanding of the kenosis is largely responsible for the development in his thought as it bears upon his concept of glory. In the *Commentary on John* Cyril clearly links the passion of Christ to glory in a way that he had not before. In his earlier writings Cyril saw in the cross a sign of glory; but now the cross is seen as glorious in its own right. The kenosis of the Son is used to interpret and explain the Son's prayer for glory and the passion is the climax and the glory of the kenosis. It is not untrue to say that for Cyril the Son needs to be glorified in the flesh. Moreover, recalling Cyril's comments on John 17:17 the Son who empties himself out on the cross proved himself to be the second Adam. This is a splendid example of how Cyril's primary Christological categories converge and rely upon one another.

For Cyril the second Adam cannot be disassociated from his headship. Cyril explains the headship of the second Adam in a context that is eucharistic. This headship of the second Adam is always in relation to the body that is the Church which is caused by the eucharist. Those who partake of the glorified flesh of Christ in the eucharist are united with Christ and each other and become one body. The corporeal unity that Cyril speaks of is clearly the unity between church and Christ. The church is Christ's body and the second Adam is the head of the body. The unity of Christ who is the second Adam is crucial here: if the flesh of Christ is not the flesh of the Son of the Father who emptied himself out then the flesh of Christ does not have the power to give life and the church is joined to a mere man. It is in this eucharistic emphasis of Cyril's that it becomes strikingly clear that both the divinity and the humanity of Christ are indispensable for salvation. Lastly, it is here that the close connection between Cyril's Christology and eucharistic theology is evident because for Cyril the headship of Adam, the *anakephalaiosis*, is a way of explaining the incarnation. In so far as this is true for Cyril his Christology has a eucharistic context. In other words, whenever Cyril uses the Adamic typology to explicate the incarnation his Christology cannot be disassociated from his understanding of the eucharist. The two are intimately

linked. This suggests that there is a synthesis between Cyril's theology of worship and eucharist and his Christology.

Chapter Four: Christ's Worship as the Basis for Christology.

"Our opinion agrees with the eucharist, and the eucharist in turn confirms our opinion."[1] Irenaeus of Lyons upheld this foundational principle against the Gnostics. More than 200 years later, Cyril of Alexandria upheld the same principle. Cyril's understanding of the eucharist and his theology of worship shapes and governs the basis of his Christology as it is found in the *Commentary on John*. Here it should be recalled that Cyril deepened the Athanasian theological starting point which had situated the mediating activity of the Christ in his incarnate state and did not restrict this activity to the Savior's divine sonship. I claimed that the main focus of Cyril's Christology was not upon speculation about the Logos apart from his incarnation and the economy of salvation but rather was upon the Christ as revealed and active in salvation history.

In the preceding chapters I maintained that Cyril inherited this emphasis upon the historical Christ from Athanasius and that he realized it more profoundly than his great master. Cyril's usual emphasis upon the historical Christ, and the location of his mediating activity in his concrete, historical, and incarnate state, *is an emphasis which is fundamentally liturgical.* An understanding of Christ as high priest and mediator is central to Cyril's theology of worship and to his Christology. Christ as high priest worships as man, though without sin, prays and offers

[1] Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, Bk.4, 18, 4-5, Sources chrétiennes, ed. L. Doutreleau, v.100 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1965) 610. The English translation is mine.

himself to the Father for us. At the same time that Christ offers himself for us, he also offers fallen humanity through and in himself to the Father. Thus for Cyril we can approach and know the Father only insofar as we are united with Christ, and so can worship and pray in and through him. This theology of worship demands a concrete union between Christ and the baptized; it is actual in Christ who as high priest and mediator unites the baptized to himself as the second Adam, the new head of humanity.

This mode of this union with Christ, as we have seen, is eucharistic. Through the eucharist the baptized become one body (συσσώμοι) with Christ. Christ stands in relation to this body as the second Adam who is the new head. When Cyril's theology proceeds in this fashion he cannot be placed in the predicament of choosing between a Logos-Sarx or Logos-Anthropos Christology because he speaks here of an event - the event union of the second Adam and the Church.

There is a real synthesis of Cyril's understanding of worship and eucharist with his Christology, to the point that if one is put in issue so also must be the other. Cyril's concept of Christ as high priest and mediator and his Christological categories of the kenosis and the second Adam are not unrelated. It is not surprising that in the *Commentary on John* to find Cyril saying that the *anakephalaiosis* is a way of explaining the incarnation. Moreover, for Cyril the eternal Son can pray and worship the Father because he freely emptied himself into the likeness of sinful flesh that owes worship to the Father. Time and time again Cyril appeals to the voluntary kenosis of the Son against the "Arians" who argued that the Son because of his prayers and worship was inferior to the Father.

Within the context of his understanding of Christ as high priest and mediator, Cyril's profound understanding of the importance of the soul of Christ is strikingly apparent. The Alexandrian patriarch's theology of worship, where Christ offers up prayers and adoration to the Father, shows that he saw that the soul of Christ was crucial for the economy of salvation. For only if the Son possessed a rational soul can he worship and pray to the Father as man. Cyril never tires of repeating that Christ is high priest of our souls. There is no room in his theology of worship for the idea that the Logos takes the place of the human soul or that Christ's soul is passive, without a soteriological function.

Cyril's theology of worship requires the unity of Christ. Only if Christ, who is our high priest and mediator, is fully divine and fully human can he offer the

perfect worship that humanity owes to the Father. If the prayers and worship of Christ are those only of a man, and not the worship of the Son of God as man, then his mediation is not saving because it is merely the mediation of an ordinary man who cannot put us in communion with the Father. Here too it is apparent that Cyril's theology of worship demands the communication of idioms. Any denial of the unity of Christ or of the communication of idioms strikes at the very heart of Cyril's understanding of worship in and through Christ. If a division is inserted in the person of Christ, then for Cyril the true, free and voluntary kenosis of the Son is not only denied but salvation in and through the Son is denied. If Christ is not one, then the Son of God saves us not through himself but through the death of a mere man who needs to offer sacrifice for himself and needs to be saved.

Secondly, for Cyril, to separate the Son from his humanity would negate the transformative character of worship in Christ. If the flesh of Christ is not the flesh of the Son of God, the only-begotten, then it does not have the power to overcome death and corruption. The eucharist would then join the baptized, not to the Son of God, but to a mere man. It is not surprising to find that although Cyril strongly affirms a conversion of the bread and wine offered in the eucharist into the flesh and blood of the Son, his real focus is upon the union of the baptized with the second Adam.

This chapter will explore these emphases within Cyril's understanding of the eucharist and within his theology of worship. In other words, I will explore the synthesis of Cyril's theology of worship, of the eucharist, and his Christology. My contention is that for Cyril salvation is mediated through the eucharist, and that in the eucharist we have access to Christ's salvific worship. Cyril's understanding of worship and eucharist informs his Christology and *his location of the mediating activity in the whole incarnate Christ is a liturgical insight.* This chapter makes no pretension of being an exhaustive analysis of Cyril's understanding of the theology of worship and eucharist. I will limit myself to Cyril's concept of the high priesthood of Christ, which is central to Cyril's theology of worship as this is developed in the *Commentary on John* and to Cyril's understanding of the eucharistic epiclesis, consecration and communion, which reveals his concentration upon the concrete, historical Christ as the bringer of redemption.

A) The Contribution of Thomas Torrance.

Thomas Torrance's article, "The Mind of Christ: the Problem of Apollinarianism in the Liturgy,"[2] studies the thought of Cyril within the greater concern of what happens to the worship of the Church when the human soul of Christ is denied. Unlike others who were anxious to assert the full divinity of Christ in a way that overshadowed the human priestly and mediatorial roles of Christ, Cyril did not find it necessary to downplay the human priesthood of Christ in order to refute the "Arians" who pointed to the prayers of Christ as proof that the Savior was a creature. Torrance points out that Cyril firmly upheld the underlying theological structure of the conclusion to Athanasius' work *On the Incarnation of the Word* : "Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom and with whom, to the Father with the Son himself in the Holy Spirit, be honor and power and glory forever."[3] Torrance notices, with Josef Jungman, that throughout the works of Cyril there are variations of this mediatorial and doxological formula but that at the same time Cyril takes great care to preserve the mediatorial "with" alongside of the mediatorial "through" and doxological "with".[4] Cyril, in his works, consistently upholds Christ's priestly mediation on behalf of the human race.

Torrance argued that Cyril inherited the Christological position of Athanasius which insisted that the Logos did not come into a man but became man. For Cyril, Christ is one subject and it follows from this that the eternal Son who became incarnate underwent human experiences. In Torrance's estimation all this allowed Cyril to express in developed theological terms the two-fold emphasis found in the Gospel according to John and the epistle to the Hebrews in which divinity and humanity are predicated of the one Christ. According to Torrance, Cyril strengthened the Christology of Athanasius in two ways.[5] He first did so by

---

[2] Thomas Torrance, *Theology in Reconciliation*, (Grand Rapids: Wm. Eerdmanns Co., 1976) 139-215.

[3] Athanasius, *On the Incarnation of the Word*, 57. Sources chrétiennes, v.199, ed. Charles Kannengiesser, (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1973) 469. I give Torrance's English translation.

[4] Torrance gives a long list of citations including *Glaphyra in Genesim* Bk 1, Ch..3 (P.G. 69, 49); Bk.4 Ch. (P.G. 69, 73B); Bk.1, Ch.7 (P.G. 69, Bk.1, Ch.7 (P.G. 69, 109D); Bk.1, Ch.9 (P.G. 137B). *Commentary on John*, Bk.9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 264); Bk.12, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 661)

[5] Ibid., 157-158.

stressing the human mediatorship of Christ over against the "Arians" who restricted the mediation of the Logos to his sub-divine nature, as distinct from his incarnation. This emphasis is not only anti-Arian but also anti-Apollinarian. Secondly, in his later writings Cyril strengthened the Athanasian Christology in respect to the unity of Christ's person over against Nestorius. In the eyes of Cyril, the Nestorian concept of the unity of Christ as a moral or relational union had the effect of making the humanity of Christ offer worship alongside his divinity, thus undermining Christ's priesthood.

Torrance points out that for Cyril, Christian worship is, and can only be, in and through Christ, our mediator and advocate before the Father. He claimed that in Cyril's thought the priesthood of Christ could not be isolated from Christ's economic identification with humanity."[6] Here it is important to recall that according to Torrance Cyril steadfastly upheld:

> "the mediation of salvation through the unimpaired humanity of Christ in which the activity of his human mind and soul in vicarious faith, worship and thanksgiving are essential ingredients. This implies a doctrine of the incarnation of the Son of God understood, not as the coming of God into man but as God becoming man, coming among us as man and therefore of God doing for us in a human way what we are unable to do ourselves ...[7]

Torrance submits that this doctrine of the priesthood of Christ runs directly counter to the premise shared by the "Arians", Apollinarians, and Nestorians which held it inconceivable that God could have entered human history to be one with human beings in their contingency and passion.[8] He goes on to maintain that for Cyril humanity is able to share in Christ's human mind because Christ is priest and mediator. Humans persons are thus enabled to be participants in Christ's "priestly presentation of himself and of us through himself to the Father."[9]

This presentation of Cyril's thought up to this point is entirely correct. However, Torrance comes to a conclusion that is problematic in my view. For Torrance goes on to argue that Cyril's theology of worship is primarily focused upon a mental union between the baptized and Christ. He claims this mental union is the essence of Cyril's understanding of our worship of the Father through the Son

6 Ibid., 173.

7 Ibid., 201.

8 Ibid., 202.

9 Ibid., 180.

and it is why Cyril describes Christian worship as rational worship in spirit and truth. According to Torrance, for Cyril:

> ...the intimate union with Christ in which this worship of the Father takes place, remains a union of mind between us and Christ resting on the ineffable union in him of his divine mind and the human mind which he made his own by incarnation. It is a mental union which remains also *relational* so that the creature retains his own distinctive properties in which faith and love have full place.[10]

Cyril's theology of worship, however, does not limit the union between Christ and the Church to a union of minds by faith and love. Torrance's presentation of Cyril cannot do justice to Cyril's repeated emphasis upon Christ as the second Adam and of the concorporeal union of the Church with the second Adam. Christ the high priest and mediator is the second Adam who is the head of the body which is the Church. Torrance's otherwise superb study of Cyril's thought cannnot account for the Adamic typology which Cyril uses to explicate the incarnation and which is indissociable from understanding of the eucharist and worship.

B) Christ as the Son who worships for the sake of humanity.

The first mention of Christ as a worshipper in Cyril's *Commentary on John* appears in his remarks upon Christ's encounter with the Samaritan woman at the well in John 4:22-24. At this point in his commentary, Cyril begins to express his understanding of Christ as priest and mediator. Cyril's comments in this passage are partly in response to an interlocutor who insists that the Son worshipped the Father apart from his incarnation out of necessity as one who is inferior to the Father. Not surprisingly Cyril uses the kenotic typology in reply to his opponent. His opening comments are concerned with affirming Christ could pray to the Father because he was true man. He writes:

> He speaks again as a Jew and a man, since the economy of the matter in hand demands now too this mode of speaking ... For Christ was of the seed of David according to the flesh, David of the tribe of Judah. Amongst the worshippers as man does he class himself, who together with God the Father is worshipped both by us and holy angels. For since he had put on the garb of a servant, he fulfills his ministry befitting a servant, having not lost the being God and Lord and to be

[10] Ibid., 181. Emphasis Torrance.

> worshipped. For he abides the same, even though he has become man, retaining throughout the plan of the dispensation after the flesh.[11]

Cyril then immediately appeals to the kenosis of the Son and cites Phil 2:5-8. Christ who is true God worships the Father because he descended for our sakes to a voluntary obedience and lowliness. The bishop of Alexandria insists that Christ's worship cannot be dissociated from his true kenosis. The interlocutor continues to object and says that Son does not worship as we do or as the angels; the worship of the Son is far superior to ours. Cyril replies that although Christ is a superior worshipper he does not offer worship superior to ours:

> For what (tell me) will it profit the only-begotten in respect of freedom, that his worship of the Father should be made more excellent than others? For so long as he is found among worshippers, he will be altogether a slave, and even though he be conceived of as a superior worshipper, yet will he by no means differ from creatures in respect of being originate ... but the office of servant and slave is defined in his paying worship.[12]

Cyril goes on to argue for the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son and at one point cites a favorite proof text against the "Arians", John 14:9 "He who has seen me has seen the Father." But the Alexandrian patriarch does not end his argument here. He indicates the type of worship that Christ offers is a new sort of worship: worship in spirit and truth. Cyril contrasts this new worship with the worship according to the law:

> The law therefore enjoined the half of a drachma to be paid by every one of the Jews to him who is God over all, not devising a way of getting wealth, nor contributions of money to no purpose, but imparting us instructions by clearest types. First, that no one is lord of his head, but that we all have one Lord, enrolled into servitude by the deposit of tribute; next, depicting the mental and spiritual fruits, as in grosser representation and act. For (says he) "Honor the Lord with your righteous labors, and render him the first fruits of righteousness," which came to pass through the Gospel teaching, the worship after the law being at last closed. For no longer do we think we ought to worship with external offerings the Lord of all, pressing to pay the drachma of corruptible matter: but being true worshippers, we worship God the Father in Spirit and in truth. This meaning we must suppose to lie hid in the letters of the law.[13]

Cyril here is commenting on John 4:22 but his remarks anticipate the words of Christ in John 4:23-24 "But the hour is coming and now is when the true

---

[11] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.2, Ch.5 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 212; *In Joannem*, v.2, 276)

[12] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.2, Ch.5 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 213-14; *In Joannem*, v.1, 278)

[13] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.2, Ch.5 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 216-217; *In Joannem*, v.1, 281-282)

worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth, for the Father seeks such to worship him. God is a spirit and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth." I mentioned in the last chapter that Wilken has noticed that John 4:24 provided a framework for Cyril's discussion of the whole question of the relationship between the Old and New Testament. Cyril used this text frequently in his biblical commentaries to express his conviction that Christ transformed the legal worship of the law into a spiritual worship. Thus commenting on John 4:24 in the *Commentary on John* Cyril says:

> He means now the time of his appearance and says that the type shall give way (μετασκευασθήσεσθαι) to the truth and the shadow of the law to spiritual worship: he says that through the Gospel teaching the true worshipper, that is, the spiritual man, shall be conducted to a way of life (πολιτεία) well pleasing to the Father, shall run readily to fellowship (οἰκειότητα) with God. For God is conceived of as a spirit, in reference to the embodied nature. Rightly therefore does he accept the spiritual worshipper, who does not in form and type carry in a Jewish wise the form of godliness, but in Gospel manner resplendent in he achievements of virtue and in rightness of the divine doctrines fulfills the really true worship.[14]

Here it is necessary to recall a crucial point made in the last chapter: for Cyril the transformation of the types of the law into truth has its source in the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. We saw in his comments on John 19:30 Cyril claimed that, with the death of Christ, the letter of the law no longer hid the vision of the truth. In Cyril's mind the full meaning of the Old Testament was revealed in the passion of Christ. I argued that therefore for Cyril the sacrifice of Christ instituted worship in spirit and truth. In other words, the death of Christ was an act of worship which transcended and so concluded the former worship of the law. Cyril's remarks on John 4:24 bear this out for he speaks here in the future tense because the sacrifice of Christ has not yet come to pass at this point in the Gospel according to John.[15] Therefore he writes "the type shall be transferred to the truth and the shadow of the law to spiritual worship."

Wilken has observed that in addition to the emphasis on the transference from type to truth, Cyril says in his comments on John 4:24 that worship in spirit and truth is a new way of life, a polity (πολιτεία) well pleasing to the Father.[16]

---

[14] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.2, Ch.5 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 218-19; *In Joannem*, v.1, 284-285)

[15] μετασκευασθήσεσθαι δὲ τοὺς τύπους φησὶν ἐις ἀλήθειαν, καί τὴη του νόμου σκιὰν εἰς λατρείαν πνευματικήν.

Wilken notices that not only in this passage but throughout his exegesis Cyril uses the word to πολιτεία draw attention to the differences between the old way of life under the law and the new way of life under the Gospel. According to Wilken, Cyril's association of πολιτεία with worship in spirit and truth gives form to his claim that Christ transformed everything identified with Judaism. Wilken maintains that it follows then that the way of life under the Gospel together with "incorruption" and "life" are the marks of redemption attained by Christ.[17] To this I would add that for Cyril worship in spirit and truth is given only in the gift of the Spirit.

It is necessary to recall a point we made in the last chapter: unlike the sacrifices of the law, the sacrifice of Christ was the only sacrifice which effected sanctification in the Spirit. We saw that Cyril developed this claim in his comments on John 17:18-19. The gift of the Spirit (which Cyril maintains Christ gave definitively only after his resurrection) restored the gift that humanity lost through the sin of Adam and renewed the divine image by conforming us to Christ. Moreover in his comments on John 17:17 Cyril maintained it is only in the Spirit that we know and are led by the revelation of the truth in Christ. Given all this it follows then that for Cyril worship in spirit and truth then leads to a "pneumatic" way of life. Furthermore, this way of life, well pleasing to the Father, is not remote from the eucharist. For as we have seen in the last chapter, Cyril insists that it is in the Spirit that the baptized are united to one another and the body of Christ in the eucharist and partake of the life-giving flesh of Christ which overcame death and corruption.

To resume: While Cyril frequently refers to John 4:24 throughout his exegetical writings, his emphasis upon Christ who worships as man without ceasing to be God is the greater context of his remarks in the *Commentary on John*. Cyril ends his reply to his interlocutor in this passage by insisting that Christ offers worship not because he is a Son inferior to the Father but offers the worship which fallen humanity owes to the Father:

> ... let them, going through the whole of scripture, show us the Son worshipping the Father, while he was yet bare [γυμνός] Logos, before the times of the incarnation and the garb of the servitude. For now as man, he worships unblamed ... For he does not worship in that he is Word and God, but becoming as we, he

[16] Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind,* 75f.

[17] Ibid., 76.

> undertook to endure this too as befits man, by reason of the dispensation of the flesh. The proof shall not be sought from us, but we shall know it from his own words. For what is it that he is saying to the woman of Samaria? "You worship what you do not know, we know what we worship." Is it not hence clear to everybody that in using the plural number and numbering himself with those who worship of necessity and servitude, (he speaks as one who has come in servile humanity.) For what (tell me) would hinder his drawing the worship apart into his own person, if he wished to be conceived of by us as a worshipper? For he should have rather said, I know what I worship, in order that unclassed with therest, he might appropriate the force of the utterance to himself alone. But, now most excellently and with all security he says "We," as already ranked among the bond by reason of his manhood, number among the worshippers, as a Jew by country.[18]

Cyril is clearly anxious to assert in this passage that Christ prayed as one of us as sharing our servile condition of *sarx.* Christ worships blamelessly as man and offers the worship to the Father that sinful humanity cannot offer. It should pointed out here that Cyril seems to presuppose that the eternal Son prays as man with a rational soul, with a human mind. Cyril knows that prayer is an activity of the human mind and he is at great pains to emphasize that the prayers of the Son are in no way proper to his divinity. Cyril cannot mean here that Christ prays to the Father as man without a human mind for then Christ would pray as a Son who is inferior to the Father. It is not surprising to find Cyril referring to Christ as the highpriest of our souls in his interpretation of John 17.[19] At any rate, this passage is another example of Cyril broader soteriological claim that salvation is communicated to humanity only if Christ was victorius as man.

In his comments on John 16:23-24 Cyril begins to draw together Christ's role as a mediator and his role as the perfect worshipper of the Father who offers prayers on behalf of all humanity. This emphasis reaches an apex in Cyril's remarks on John 17 which Torrance has described as "one of the great patristic works on the theology of worship."[20] In this passage Cyril says that Christ prays for us to the Father and as a mediator leads us to the Father. He writes:

> Hereby he exhorts the disciples to pray for spiritual graces, and at the same time gives them this encouragement - that what they ask they will not fail to obtain; adding the comforting assurance of the word amen to his promise that if they will go to the Father's throne and make any request, they will receive it of him,

[18] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.2, Ch.5 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 218; *In Joannem,* v.1, 283-284)

[19] For example see Cyril's comments on John 17:2 quoted below.

[20] Torrance, *Theology in Reconciliation,* 177.

he himself acting as mediator and leading them into the Father's presence. For this is the meaning of his words "in my name". For we cannot draw near unto God the Father save by the Son alone. For "through him we have obtained access one spirit unto Father" according to the scripture. Therefore he also to me unto the Father but by me " ... *And in right of his titles, Mediator, high priest, and advocate, he conveys to the Father prayers on our behalf, for he gives us all boldness to address the Father. In the name of Christ we must make our requests, for so will the Father most readily grant them ...*[21]

Cyril clearly claims here that we can only pray to the Father because of the prayers of Christ who prayed as man without ceasing to be God. Only if we pray with Christ and through him can we pray to the Father. Christ is therefore the mediator and high priest between humanity and the Father. This emphasis is further developed in Cyril's comments in John 17. I have discussed Cyril's interpretation of John 17 in the last chapter with regard to his Christological categories. At this point I will examine Cyril's remarks on John 17 with an eye towards uncovering Cyril's understanding of Christ's worship offered to the Father on our behalf.

1) Christ as high priest, mediator and victim.

I observed in the last chapter that in his remarks on John 17:1 Cyril explains that Christ can pray to the Father and ask him for glory because he emptied himself into fallen humanity. From the beginning of his interpretation of John 17 Cyril says that it was necessary that Christ, not a messenger or elder, manifest himself to be our leader and guide in all good things that lead to God and this includes prayer. Here Cyril alludes upon his concept of Christ as mediator which he explains later in greater detail.

In his interpretation of John 17:2 ("Even though you gave him authority over all flesh, that whatsoever you have given him, to them he shall give eternal life") Cyril begins to identify the prayers of Christ with his sacrifice on the cross. Christ the high priest offers to the Father the sacrifice we cannot offer because of our sin. Cyril writes:

He invites then the Father's goodness towards us. For since he is the high priest of souls, insomuch as he appeared as man, though being by nature God together with the Father. He most fittingly makes his prayer on our behalf: trying to persuade us to believe that he is, even now, the propitiation for our sins, and a

[21] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.11, Ch.2. (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 465-466; *In Joannem*, v.2, 646) Emphasis mine.

righteous advocate, as John says. Therefore also Paul, wishing us to be of this mind, thus exhorts us: "For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling our infirmities; but one that has been tempted like we are; yet without sin." Then, since he is a high priest, inasmuch as he is man, and at the same time, brought himself a blameless sacrifice to God the Father, as a ransom for the life of all men, being as it were the first fruits of mortality; that in all things he might have pre-eminence as Paul says; and he reconciles to Him the reprobate race of man upon the earth, purifying them by his own blood, and shaping them to newness of life through the Holy Spirit; and since, as we have often said, all things are accomplished by the Father through the Son in the Spirit; He molds the prayer from the blessings towards us, as mediator and high priest, though he unites with his Father in giving and providing divine and spiritual graces.[22]

According to Cyril here we are reconciled to the Father through the prayers and sacrifice of Christ. The prayers of Christ terminate in his sacrifice. Christ is the high priest, offerer and offering. For Cyril, in so far as Christ is high priest, who offers prayers on our behalf, he is also the mediator between fallen humanity and the Father. Christ is a mediator not solely because of who he is as the Son who emptied himself out; he is mediator because of both who he is and what he does for us: the eternal Son made flesh who offers the spotless sacrifice to the Father that we cannot offer and through this sacrifice unites us to the Father.[23] Cyril will insist upon this again in his comments on John 17:9-11. Christ in this scheme is not a mediator out of necessity because he is inferior to the Father as some would have him; he mediates as man, without ceasing to be God, in his concrete historical actions.

It is also evident in the passage above that Cyril maintains that the gift of the Spirit is given only after Christ has offered himself up to the Father and has risen from the dead. Cyril clearly claims here that Christ as mediator forms us into new life and unites us to the Father only in the Spirit. As I have observed previously,

---

[22] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.4 (tr. T. Randall, v. 483-484; *In Joannem*, v.2, 663-664.

[23] Cyril also speaks in this manner about the sacrifice of Christ in his comments on John 6:68 where he argues that the ark of the covenant fore-typified Christ. He writes:

> But the position of the burned offering at the very doors of the tabernacle, holding out a type of his death and of his sacrifice for all, again signifies, that not otherwise can we come to God the Father ... For one is Christ among us even though he be manifoldly conceived of, a tabernacle by reason of the veil of flesh, an ark holding the divine law as the Word of God the Father a table again as life and food, a candlestick as spiritual light both altar of incense, as an odor of a sweet smell in sanctification, and altar of burned offering, as a sacrifice for the light of the world. And things that are therein are sanctified; for Christ is holy all of him ... *Commentary on John,* Bk.4, Ch.4, (tr. Pusey, v.1, 453; *In Joannem,* v.1, 574)

Cyril goes on to claim in this passage that because of his voluntary kenosis the Son could say that the Father gave him authority over all flesh.

Cyril's opening comments on John 17:4-5, where Christ asks the Father to glorify him, insist upon the unity of Christ's person. This of course has been presupposed in Cyril's remarks on John 17 up to this point but here Cyril is explicit: Christ, though human and divine, is one. According to Cyril here, Christ's prayer teaches that he is not merely God, the only-begotten, but that he is also man. Cyril cites the Philippians text here in order to explain how Christ can pray to the Father to be glorified. Here again Cyril insists that Christ mediates in his kenotic, incarnate state. Cyril also says in this passage that Christ's prayer to the Father enables us to pray:

> In order then, that he might show us, that we might suitably ask for glory in return from the only true God, I mean the glory in the world to come, when we have displayed towards him perfect and blameless obedience and have shown ourselves keepers of his commandments to the letter. Christ says that he glorified the Father, when he finished the work upon the earth that the Father gave him. He requests, however, for himself in return, no foreign or borrowed glory, as we do, but rather that honor and renown which is his own. For we were bound to ask for it and not he. Observe how in and through his own person he first renders possible to our nature this boldness of speech, on two accounts. For in him first, and through him, we have been enriched both with the ability to fulfill those things essential to our salvation which are entrusted to us by God, and also the duty of bodily asking for the honor which is due to those who distinguish themselves in his service. For of old time, through the sin that reigned in us and the fall that was Adam, we failed of ability to accomplish any of those things which make for virtue, and also were very far removed from freedom of speech with God ... As then in all other things that are good our Lord Jesus Christ is the beginning and the gate and the way so also is he here.[24]

This lengthy passage raises the question of what Cyril means when he says that Christ makes us able to pray to the Father for glory. Cyril gives us a clue to what he means here when he goes on to say in this passage that Christ glorified the Father by the fact that he raised up the fallen human race, made death powerless, destroyed sin and overturned the dominion of the devil. The full meaning of this passage cannot be grasped unless it is kept in mind what Cyril has said earlier about glory.

---

[24] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch..6 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 492-493; *In Joannem,* v.2, 672)

We saw in Cyril comments on 13:31-32 that his understanding of glory underwent a development. There he linked Christ's glory to the passion. Cyril argued that the consummation of Christ's glory was "his suffering for the life of the world and fashioning a new way through his resurrection for the resurrection of all."[25] Thus, for Cyril, Christ's prayer for glory is an obedient prayer to the Father for the salvation that comes through his sacrifice, death and resurrection. This is the glory which Christ enables us to pray for. For us to pray for glory is for us to pray in and through Christ for the salvation given in his death and resurrection. There is an unmistakable emphasis in this passage of praying in and through Christ. Cyril also clearly wishes to make the point that Christ reverses the disobedience of the first Adam which tainted our prayer to the Father. Christ offers the prayer that we are unable to offer by ourselves alone. This passage shows that for Cyril prayer to the Father for the glory of salvation, the fullness of which Cyril is careful to maintain is in the world to come, is always in and through Christ who is the beginning, the gate and the way.

In his comments on John 17:9-11a ("I pray for them not for the world, but for those whom you have given me ...") Cyril underscores his emphasis that the prayers of Christ terminate in his sacrifice which reconciled us to the Father:

> He once more mediates as man, the reconciler and mediator of God and men; and being our truly great and all holy high priest, by his own prayers he appeases the anger of his Father, sacrificing himself for us. For he is the sacrifice; and he is our priest, himself our mediator, himself blameless victim, the true lamb which takes away the sins of the world.[26]

Here again Cyril reiterates his point that Christ is our mediator in his sacrifice to the Father, a sacrifice we cannot offer because of our sin. He goes on to say that the "Mosaic ceremonial" was a type and a shadow of the mediation of Christ and contrasts the mediation of Moses with the mediation of Christ:

> For the things of the law are shadows of the truth. For the inspired Moses, and with him the eminent Aaron, continually intervened between God and the assembly of the people. On the one hand deprecating God's anger for the transgressions of the people of Israel, and inviting mercy from above upon them when they were faint. On the other hand praying and blessing the people ordering sacrifices according to the law and offering of gifts besides in their appointed order, sometimes for sins, and sometimes for thank offerings for the benefits they felt that they had received from God. But Christ who manifested himself in the last

[25] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.9 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 209; *In Joannem*, v.2, 378)

[26] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.8 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 506-507; *In Joannem,* v.2, 378)

> times above the types of the law, at once our high priest and mediator, prays for us as man; and at the same time is ever ready to co-operate with Godthe Father ... He prays then for us as man, and also unites in distributing good gifts to us as God. For he, being a holy high priest, blameless and undefiled, offered himself not for his own weakness, as was the custom of those to whom was allotted the duty of sacrificing according to the law, but rather for the salvation of our souls, and that once for all, because of our sin and is advocate for us.[27]

It should be noted here that Wilken has pointed out that Cyril throughout his biblical commentaries often compares and contrasts Christ with Moses.[28] Wilken calls attention to the little noticed work of Luis Armendariz,[29] who showed that Cyril's conception of Moses was radically Christocentric. Cyril viewed Moses from the perspective of salvation history which was fulfilled in Christ. Wilken, following Armendariz, says that while Cyril sees Moses as a type of Christ his real emphasis is upon Moses as a symbol of all that Christ transforms and surpasses.[30] For Cyril, Moses as a mediator of the law offered something important for humanity but the legal worship that he offered was unable to overcome the death and corruption that entered the human race because of Adam's sin. In the end Moses was a minister of condemnation because through him the law was given to condemn the world in its sins and was thus incapable of giving fallen humanity perfect and full knowledge of God.[31] Only in Christ do we see things in truth; the truth that lay hidden in the types of the law.

---

[27] Ibid.

[28] Wilken, *Judaism and Early Christian Mind,* 150f.

[29] Luis Armendariz, *El Nuevo Moises. Dinámica* ***christocéntrica en la tiplogica de Cirilo Alejandrino,*** (Madrid, 1962).

[30] Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind,* 151.

[31] Wilken cites Cyril's comments on John 1:16-17, *Commentary on John,* Bk.1, Ch.9 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 118-119; *In Joannem,* v.1, 151-52) It should be noted at this point that there is also the emphasis in Cyril's thought that Christ by his sacrifice and death took upon himself our condemnation of death under the law and paid the penalty for our sins. Lars Koen, "Saving Passion", 105-121 has drawn attention to this emphasis in Cyril's *Commentary on John.* This theme is clear in Cyril's comments on John 19:16-19 where he writes:

> "The cross, then, that Christ bore, was not for his own deserts, but was the cross that awaited us, and was our due, through our condemnation under the law. For as he was numbered among the dead, not for himself, but for our sakes, that we might find in him, the author of everlasting life, subduing of himself the power of death; so also, he took upon himself the cross that was our due, passing on himself the condemnation of the law, that the mouth of all lawlessness might henceforth be stopped, according to the saying of the Psalmist: the sinless having suffered condemnation for the sin of all. See *Commentary on John,* Bk.12 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 624; *In Joannem,* v.3, 80-81)

I would add to Wilken's observations that Cyril's insistence upon Christ's transformation of the Mosaic types into truth must be understood in the greater context of Cyril's theology of worship, which sees Christ as the high priest who offers the perfect sacrifice to the Father. In the passage above, Moses, who as a mediator foreshadowed Christ, was unable to overcome the sin and death through the worship of the law. But Christ who as high priest and mediator offers the perfect worship to the Father through his spotless sacrifice. Cyril's view that the sacrifice of Christ transformed the types into the truth is fully present here.

Cyril continues to say that Christ as high priest and mediator brings those who believe in him to the Father thus reconciling the world. He writes:

> For to those only, whose mediator and high priest he is, he thought it right to bring the blessings of his mediation; to those, I mean, who, he says, were given to himself, but were the Father's, as there is no other way of fellowship with God save by the Son. And he will teach you this in the words: "No one comes to the Father except through the Son." For observe how the Father, when he gave to his Son those of whom he speaks, won them over to himself. And the apostle, who was so conversant with the sacred writings, knowing this well, says: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." For when Christ acted as a mediator, and received those who come to him by faith, and brought them aright through himself to the Father, the world was reconciled to God.[32]

For Cyril the only way to the Father is through the Son who offered the perfect sacrifice and through this sacrifice presents us to the Father. In Cyril's eyes Christ is a mediator who unites the baptized to himself. Cyril will spell this out in greater detail in his later remarks on how Christ accomplishes this unification as mediator. Up to this point Cyril's position is fairly clear: Christ, the eternal Son who emptied himself out into the likeness of sinful flesh, as high priest offers prayers to the Father on our behalf. Christ's prayers, which are not tainted with the sin of Adam, culminate in the spotless sacrifice of himself to the Father on the cross. This sacrifice, this new worship, transforms the old worship of the law, conquers sin and death and put us in communion with the Father. We can only worship in this new way with and in Christ who makes it possible to address the Father and ask him for glory, the glory of salvation given in Christ. Christ in this scheme is a historical mediator because his mediation takes place in the economy of salvation. The one Lord Jesus Christ mediates through his historical actions.

---

[32] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.11, Ch..8 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 508; *In Joannem*, v.2, 690-691)

Cyril concludes his remarks on John 17:9-11 by insisting that Christ has all that the Father has and is the image of the Father. Throughout his interpretation of John 17 up to this point, Cyril has repeatedly maintained that Christ prays to the Father as man without ceasing to be the Son who is consubstantial with the Father. Christ is one reality. The unity of Christ here is crucial: the prayers of Christ which terminate in his sacrifice must be the prayers of God the Son in the flesh who does not need to offer sacrifice for himself. The sacrifice of a mere man, who is not the Son, who offers himself for his own weakness would not transform the legal worship mediated by Moses, which could not overcome sin, corruption and death. Secondly, if the prayers of Christ are not the prayers of the only begotten Son in the flesh then his kenosis, is denied. Cyril's understanding of Christ as high priest and mediator who offers the perfect worship to the Father on our behalf requires the unity of Christ's person.

In the last chapter we saw that Cyril, unlike Athanasius, interprets John 17:11b ("Holy Father, keep them in your name which you have given me that they may be one, even as we are") in reference to the eucharist. Cyril begins to explain here his understanding of how, as mediator and high priest, Christ unites humanity. After saying that Christ wishes his disciples to be linked together in the bond of brotherly love that they might resemble the unity between the Father and the Son, Cyril writes:

> For as we read in the Acts of the Apostles, the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul, in the unity that is of the Spirit. And this is what Paul himself also meant when he said: One body and one Spirit; for we all partake of the one bread, and we have all received the unction of one Spirit, that is, the Spirit of Christ. As, then they were to be one body, and to partake of one and selfsame Spirit. He desires his disciples to be preserved in a unity of spirit which nothing could disturb, and unbrokenness in singleness of mind.[33]

Christ as mediator unites his disciples in the gift of the Spirit and in his body in the eucharist. This claim is brilliantly and more fully set forth in his comments on John 17:20-21. Cyril continues to refer to this theme in his comments on John 17:13 where he insists that the flesh of the Christ is the channel of eternal life because it is the flesh of the eternal Son.[34] But before he explains the specific

[33] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.9 (tr. Pusey, v.2, 514; *In Joannem,* v.2, 697-698)

[34] It should be noted here that Cyril also insists on this point in his comments on the Bread of Life discourse in John 6. For example, remarking on John 6:53 ("Amen, Amen I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood you have no life in you"), he writes:

nature of the unity affected by Christ as mediator, Cyril draws together his Christological categories of the kenosis and the second Adam. This occurs within the context of his interpretation of Christ words "I sanctify myself" in John 17:18-19. This passage was examined at some length in the last chapter. Here it should be recalled that, according to Cyril, Christ's words refer to his forthcoming passion whereby he will sanctify his disciples in the Spirit. Cyril insists again that Christ prays to the Father for this sanctification because he is our mediator and advocate. Christ's sacrifice was capable of accomplishing this sanctification because it was the sacrifice of the only-begotten Son who alone has the power to sanctify in the Spirit. Cyril then states that the Son who emptied himself out proved that he was the second Adam who gives new life in the Spirit. I have observed all this in the preceding chapter. What should be pointed out here is that this movement of Cyril's thought is linked to his intention of explaining more specifically how Christ unites as mediator. The Adamic typology is crucial to Cyril's understanding of Christ as mediator. This becomes strikingly clear in his comments on John 17:20-21. I have examined this passage previously in order to show that the second Adam typology is constitutive of Cyril's Christology. I will now explore Cyril's interpretation of John 17:20-21 again in order to show that Cyril's concept of Christ as mediator is integral to his understanding of Christ as the second Adam.

2) The union of the second Adam and the church.

From the very beginning of his remarks on John 17:20-21 Cyril explicitly associates the second Adam typology with the emphasis upon Christ as mediator. Cyril begins his interpretation of this passage in the Gospel according to John claiming that:

> And since the flesh of the Savior has become life giving (as being united to that which is by nature life, the Word from God), when we taste it, then we have life ourselves, we too united to it as it to the indwelling Word. For this cause also when he raised the dead, the Savior is found to have operated, not by word only, or God befitting commands, but he laid stress on employing his holy flesh as a sort of co-operator unto this, that he might show that it had the power to give life, and was already made one with him ... He touches the dead, thereby also infusing life into those already decayed. And if by touch alone of his holy flesh, he gives life to that which is decayed, how shall we not profit yet more richly by the life-giving blessing when we also taste it? Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.4, Ch.2 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 418-419; *In Joannem,* v.1, 530)

Here Cyril clearly refers to the eucharist and underscores the importance of the unity of Christ and communication of idioms. For if the flesh of Christ is not the flesh of the eternal Son then it has no power to give life and the transforming power of salvation is undone.

> Christ is, as it were, the first fruits of those who are built up into newness of life, and himself the first heavenly man. For, as Paul says: "The Second Adam is the Lord from heaven." Therefore John wrote: "And no man has ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man" ... They his followers were then, and are after him, who is far above all others, the head of the body the Church, the precious and more estimable members thereof. Furthermore he prays that on them the blessing and sanctification of the Spirit may be sent down from his Father, but through him wholly ... [35]

In Cyril's mind Christ's prayer for unity is a prayer for the corporeal and spiritual unity of his disciples. Cyril then goes on to speak of the second Adam as the mediator between God and man, the advocate and high priest and mediator whose prayer for unity is not only for his disciples but also for those who follow after them. As Cyril's continues his interpretation his understanding of the unity affected by Christ as mediator becomes explicit. Christ unites his followers spiritually through the gift of the Spirit. Christ who is the second Adam restores the Spirit lost because of the sin of Adam. Cyril writes:

> And He thought it not right to leave us in doubt about the objects of his prayer, that we might learn hereby what manner of men we ought to show ourselves, and what path of righteousness we ought to tread, to accomplish those things which are well pleasing to him. What, then, is the manner of his prayer? That, he says, they may one; even as you, Father are in me, and I in you, that they also may be in us. He asks, then, for a bond of love, and concord, and peace, to bring into spiritual unity those who believe; so that their unity, through perfect sympathy and inseparable harmony of soul, might resemble the features of the essential unity that exists between the Father and the Son.[36]

Christ's prayer is directed towards a unity that is both spiritual and corporeal. For Cyril goes on to affirm that Christ, who is the second Adam, as mediator unites his followers corporeally in the eucharist. Christ, the second Adam, makes his followers concorporeal in his body. Moreover the second Adam is the head of the body. Cyril insists that:

> For by one body, that is, his own, blessing through the mystery of the eucharist those who believe on him, he makes us of the same body (συσσώμους) with himself and with each other. For who could sunder or divide from their natural union with one another those who are knit together through his holy body, which is one in union with Christ? For if we all partake of the one bread, we are all made one body; for Christ cannot suffer severance. Therefore the church has

[35] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.11, Ch.11, (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 544; *In Joannem*, v.2, 729-730.

[36] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.11, Ch.11 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 546; *In Joannem*, v.2, 731)

> become Christ's body, and we are also individually his members, according to the understanding of Paul. For we, being all us united to Christ through his holy-body, in as much as we have received him who is one and indivisible in our own bodies, owe service of our members to him rather than to ourselves. And that while the Savior is accounted the head (κεφαλην), the church is called the rest of the body, as joined together of Christian members ... And if we are all of us of the same body with one another in Christ, and not only with one another, but also of course with him who is in us through his flesh, are we not then all of us clearly with one another and Christ?[37]

Cyril's entire interpretation of John 17 is a synthesis of his theology of worship and the eucharist and Christology of the kenosis and the second Adam. This synthesis rises to a crescendo in his remarks on John 17:20-21. Christ, the high priest of our souls who is our mediator, can pray to the Father because he is the Son who emptied himself out into the likeness of sinful flesh. At the same time Christ the mediator must be the second Adam the new head, who unites humanity spiritually and corporeally. When Cyril's Christology proceeds in this fashion he cannot be put in the position of choosing between a Logos-Sarx or Logos-Anthropos Christology because his inquiry is focussed upon a free event-union between Christ the second Adam and the Church. It is within in this context that Cyril lays bare the full significance of his claim, made in his comments on John 14:20, that the *anakephalaiosis* a way of explaining the incarnation.

Elsewhere in his *Commentary on John* Cyril is emphatic that the eucharistic union between Christ and the Church is not merely an immaterial, contemplative union of faith and love. Cyril affirms this quite explicitly in his comments on John 15:1 (I am the true vine ...) During the course of his interpretation of this passage an interlocutor claims that John 15:1 shows the Son to be of a different essence from the Father because the vinedresser and the vine are different in substance. Cyril's interlocutor argues further that the vine refers only to the Son's semi-divinity and not to his flesh. In the eyes his interlocutor, salvation is not reliant upon the flesh of Christ. Cyril has his interlocutor say:

> But will it not be clear to everyone, he says, that our body has no dependence on the flesh of the savior as the branches on the vine, nor yet is the fruit of the saints fleshly but spiritual? Therefore, he says putting on one side for the present all references to flesh, we say that the meaning of the speech relates to the divinity

[37] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch.11, (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 550-551; *In Joannem,* v.2, 735)

itself of the Son; and we maintain that divinity is the vine on which we depend by faith.[38]

Cyril answers:

For that we are spiritually united with Christ in a disposition made conformable to perfect love, in true and uncorrupted faith, in virtue and purity of mind, the statement of our doctrine will in no way deny. For we confess that he is quite right in saying this; but venturing to say that no reference is intended to our union with him after the flesh, we will point out that he is wholly out of harmony with the inspired writings. For how could it be disputed, or what right minded man could deny, that Christ is the vine in this relation? And we, as being branches after a figure, receive into ourselves life out of proceeding from him as Paul says "For we are all one body in Christ, seeing that we who are many are one bread: for we all partake of the one bread." And let anyone account for this and give us an interpretation of it without reference to the power of the blessed mystery. Why do we receive it within us? Is it not that it may make Christ to dwell in us corporeally also by participation and communion of his holy flesh? Rightly would he answer, I think. For Paul writes, "that the Gentiles have become fellow members (συσσώμα) of the body, fellow-partakers, and fellow-heirs of Christ." How are they shown to be "embodied"? Because, being admitted to share the holy eucharist, they become one body with him.[39]

In this passage Cyril faces the heart of his interlocutor's position: the mediating activity of the Son applies only to his divinity and not to his humanity. Cyril's reply, strongly upholding the unity of Christ, explicitly rejects the doctrine that the mediation of Christ refers only to his semi-divinity. This passage is a good example of Cyril's denial of this sort of soteriological point of departure. Cyril is not concerned with how to relate the Logos to his humanity in order to refute his interlocutor. Rather, this passage is a clear example of Cyril's Christological focus upon the union between Christ and the Church. In so far as Cyril is concerned for

---

[38] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.10, Ch.2 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 369; *In Joannem,* v.2, 539)

[39] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.10, Ch.2 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 369; *In Joannem,* v.2, 541-542) Much the same emphasis appears in Cyril's comments on John 17:22-23 where he says:

For the Son dwells in us in a corporeal sense as man, co-mingled and united with us by the mystery of the eucharist; and also in a spiritual sense as God, by the effectual working and grace of his own Spirit building up our Spirit into newness of life, and making us partakers of his divine nature. Christ then is seen to be the bond of union between us and God the Father: as man making us as it were, his branches and as God by nature inherent in his own Father, For in no other wise could that nature which is subject to corruption be uplifted into incorruption, but by the coming down to it of that nature which is high above all corruption and variableness ...

Cyril goes on to say that the mediation of Christ makes us "perfect in unity with God the Father" *Commentary on John,* Bk.11, Ch..12 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 554; *In Joannem,* v.3, 2-3). This entire emphasis in Cyril's thought is difficult to square with Torrance's thesis that for Cyril our "mental union with Christ" is the "essence of our worship of the Father through the Son."

this union, the eucharistic liturgy informs his Christology. Furthermore, whenever Cyril's thought proceeds in this manner it requires the communication of idioms for, if the flesh of Christ is not the flesh of the Logos, it does not have the power to give life, overcome corruption and put humanity in communion with the Father.

C) The Eucharist and the historical immanence of Christ: Cyril's concept of the consecration and the epiclesis.

Cyril's understanding of the eucharist is concerned for the historical immanence of the risen Christ. His concept of the consecration and epiclesis of the eucharistic liturgy testify to the priority of this emphasis in his thought. Given that Cyril lays great emphasis upon the idea that Christ, the second Adam, unites humanity corporeally to his flesh, his affirmation of the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ should come as no surprise. Johannes Betz has noticed that Cyril is the first Christian theologian in Egypt to use a *"Wandlungbegriff"* when speaking about the conversion of the bread and wine in the Eucharist.[40]

For Cyril, it is Christ, not the pre-human Logos who is the term of the conversion of the elements in the Eucharist. Cyril explicitly speaks of this conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in his two of his later works, in the *Commentary on Matthew* (extant only in fragments) and in his *Commentary on Luke*. Remarking on Matt 26:27 Cyril writes:

> After the Lord took the cup, he gives thanks, that is, in the form of a prayer he speaks with God the Father, manifesting that he is, as it were, the partner and cosigner of the life-giving blessing to be given to us, and at the same time giving us a pattern (τύπος) first giving thanks, and then breaking the bread and distributing it. Therefore, we also, placing the aforementioned objects before the eyes of God, we ask (δεόμεθα) earnestly that they maybe remodeled] (πλασθῆναι) into a spiritual blessing, that partaking of these things, we may be sanctified in body and soul. But he said quite plainly This is my body, and This is my blood, so that you may not suppose that the things you see are a type; rather, in some ineffable way they are changed (μεταποίεσθαι) by God, into the body and blood of Christ truly offered. Partaking of them, we take into us the life-giving and sanctifying power of Christ ... For God puts the power of life into the offerings,

[40] Johannes Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter*, (Freiburg: Herder, 1955) 313.

bringing Himself down to our weakness, and he changes (μεθίσταναι) them into the energy of his own life.[41]

Commenting on Luke 22:17-22 in his *Commentary on Luke* Cyril writes:

But He is also in us in another way by means of our partaking in the oblation of unbloody offering which we celebrate in the churches, having received from him the saving pattern of the rite, as the blessed evangelist plainly shows us in the passage which has been read. For he tell us that "He took a cup, and gave thanks, and said: Take this, and divide it with one another." ... And this act, then was a pattern for our use of prayer which ought to be offered, whenever the grace of the mystical and life-giving oblation is about to be spread before Him by us ... It was fitting, therefore, for Him to be in us divinely by the Holy Spirit, and also so to speak, to be mingled with our bodies by his holy flesh and precious blood, which things also we possess as a life giving blessing, in the form of bread and wine. For lest we be terrified by seeing flesh and blood placed on the holy tables of our churches, God, humbling Himself to our infirmities, infuses into things set before us the power of life, and transforms them into the efficacy of his flesh, that we may have them for a life-giving participation, and that the body of Life may be found in us as a life-producing seed. And do not doubt that this is true, since He Himself plainly says This is my body, This is my Blood ...[42]

In both passages Cyril is simply content to affirm a conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. Nowhere in any of his writings does Cyril attempt to explain how the conversion occurs. In his comments on John 6:53 Cyril says that we should not ask "how" in regard to this conversion for Christ "explained not the mode of the mystery, but to those who had now believed, he is found to declare it most clearly".[43] Secondly, fully present in these passages is Cyril's emphasis upon the fact that Christ teaches us to pray and that we are to pray with him. Cyril's affirmation that Christ words and actions "are a pattern for our use of prayer" shows that his interpretation of the institution narrative cannot be disassociated from his emphasis that Christ is our high priest and advocate before God the Father. For Cyril, in the eucharist we participate in the prayers and sacrifice of Christ, a sacrifice which transforms the old worship of the law into a new worship.

[41] Cyril, *Commentary on Matthew,* 26:27, P.G. 72, 512CD. I have slightly reworked Daniel Sheerin's translation which appears in his *Message of the Fathers of the Church: The Eucharist,* (Wilmington, De: Michael Glazier, 1986) 225-226.

[42] Cyril, *Commentary on the Gospel according to Luke,* 22:17-22. Here I follow R. Payne Smith's translation of the Syriac version of the *Commentary on the Gospel according to Luke,* (Reprint, Studion Publishers, 1983) 568-569. There are only fragments of this commentary in Greek..

[43] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.4, Ch.2 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 418; *In Joannem,* v.2, 530)

In both of the texts cited above Cyril refers to God putting the power of life into the offerings. This raises questions about Cyril's understanding of the epiclesis. Alexandrian theologians before Cyril, most notably Serapion and Athanasius, knew of a Logos-epiclesis and spoke of the Logos descending or coming down (επιδημησατω) on the bread and cup.[44] Nowhere, to my knowledge in any of the extant texts does Cyril refer precisely in this way to the Logos coming down (επιδημησατω) upon the offerings.

Ezra Gebremedhin argues that Cyril understood the epiclesis primarily in reference to the Logos. He claims that a Spirit epiclesis was probably an established element in the liturgy known to Cyril. Gebremedhin thinks that while Cyril probably did know of a Spirit epiclesis he says very little about it or of the interaction between the Spirit and the offerings.[45] This leads Gebremedhin to believe that Cyril's understanding of the epiclesis is Logos oriented rather than Spirit oriented.[46] In his comments on Luke 22:17-22 in his *Commentary on Luke* Cyril does identify "the power of life" with the only begotten Logos. Whatever the case may be, Cyril's references to the Logos in the context of the eucharist are not references to the non-human Logos. Even Gebremedhin[47] admits that Cyril speaks of

---

[44] The reference in the text taken from Serapion's anaphora runs as follows:

> O God of Truth, may your holy Word come down upon (επιδημησατω) this bread, that it may become the body of the Word, and upon the cup, that it may become the blood of the Truth.

This translation appears in Lucien Deiss, *The Springtime of the Liturgy: Liturgical texts of the First Four Centuries,* tr. Matthew O'Connell (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1979) 196. Athanasius' reference to the Logos-epiclesis is found in his *Orations to the Baptized,* (P.G. 26, 1325C). Here I follow Gebremedhin's translation of this passage in his "Life-Giving Blessing" at 62:

> This bread and cup so long as the prayers and supplication are not yet made, are bare elements. But when the great prayers and the holy supplications are sent up to God, the Word descends upon the bread and cup and they become his body. Johannes Quasten has observed that the Logos-epiclesis was also known to Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzen. See Johannes Quasten, *Patrology,* v.3 (Westminster MD: Newman, 1960) 83.

[45] Ibid, 60. Gebremedhin thinks that in the primitive version of the anaphora of St. Mark there existed a second epiclesis immediately following the words of institution. Gebremedhin believes that Cyril knew of this epiclesis because he speaks of an earnest prayer (Gebremedhin translates δεόμεθα as prayer) requesting the remodeling of the gifts in comments on Matt 26:27 and of "prayer which ought to be offered" in his comments on Luke 22:17-22. In my view this is not overwhelming evidence that Cyril knew of a second epiclesis. Geoffrey Cuming believes that the prayer Gebremedhin refers to is vague and only an epiclesis in a general sense. See Geoffrey Cuming, *The Liturgy of St. Mark,* (Rome: Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 1990) 125.

[46] Gebremedhin, "Life-Giving Blessing," 61-64.

[47] Ibid, 61.

the Logos and Christ interchangeably in regard to the eucharist. Gebremedhin notices that at one point in his *Ad Calosyrium*[48] Cyril speaks of Christ as perfecting and blessing the gifts celebrated in the churches. Whenever he speaks of the eucharist Cyril's attention is always focussed on the historical immanence of the Logos who is the Christ.[49]

The relation of Cyril's sacramental understanding of the eucharistic liturgy is indispensable to the Christology of Cyril's biblical commentaries. For Cyril the transformative power of salvation in Christ is communicated to humanity through the eucharist. The eucharist, in the eyes of Cyril, is the sacramental commemoration of the sacrifice, death and resurrection of Christ. Commenting on John 20:26-27 Cyril writes:

> For that the partaking of the blessed eucharist is a confession of the resurrection of Christ is clearly proved by his own words, which he spoke when he himself performed the type of mystery; for he broke bread as it is written, and gave it to them, saying: "This is my Body, which is given for you unto the remission of sins: this do in remembrance of me." Participation, then, in the divine mysteries, in addition to filling us with divine blessedness, is a true confession and memorial of Christ's dying and rising again for us and for our sake.[50]

For Cyril, Christology must conform to this liturgical praxis of the church and an interpretation of Christ that is not based upon it undermines humanity's salvation in Christ. Here we find the real source of Cyril's pre-occupation with the immanence of Christ in history and his insistence upon locating the mediating activity of the Christ in his incarnate state. This insight is fundamentally a soteriological insight, and hence a liturgical insight, because for Cyril salvation in Christ is mediated through the celebration of the eucharist.

---

[48] Cyril, *Ad Calosyrium,* (P.G. 76, 1097BC) Τοίνυν τὰς εν ταις εκκλησίαις δωροφρίας ἁγιαζεσθαιπιστεύομεν καὶ εὐλογεισθαι καὶ τελειοουσθαι παρὰ Χριστοῦ.

[49] It should also be pointed out in this context that while Henry Chadwick was right to argue that the eucharist is central to Cyril's religion. On the other hand, there is little evidence to support Chadwick's claim that for Cyril the eucharistic liturgy had to do with a reincarnation of the Logos. Such a view is certainly not expressed in any of the texts examined above and I know of no text that suggests that Cyril understood stood the eucharist in this way. The idea that every eucharist was a re-incarnation of the Logos would suppose that after the resurrection the Logos somehow shed or his humanity. But as we have seen, Cyril insisted that the resurrection of Christ involved a transformation of the Savior's humanity which makes the transformation our humanity possible. For Chadwick's view see "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy," *Journal of Theological Studies,* 2 (n.s.) (1951): 145-161, especially 155.

[50] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.12, Ch.1, (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 684; *In Joannem,* v.3, 145)

D.) Conclusion

Throughout this study of Cyril's thought I have maintained that Cyril inherited from Athanasius the doctrine that the starting point of theology is the salvation in Christ which is mediated through the Savior's concrete historical existence. Cyril expressed this insight in terms of Christ as high priest and mediator whose prayer-mediation is the basis and foundation of our prayers to the Father. If one carefully studies Cyril's development of this insight in his biblical commentaries, especially the *Commentary on John*, it is apparent that Cyril worked out the Christological details of this soteriological and liturgical insight, which is focussed upon the historical immanence of Christ in history and the economy of salvation.

Cyril's fundamental Christological categories of the kenosis and the second Adam serve to explicate this central theological point of departure. Whether Cyril uses the kenosis to explain how Christ can pray to the Father for glory (the fullness of which is his suffering on our behalf) or whether Cyril employs the second Adam typology to explain how Christ as mediator unites humanity through the eucharist, both Christological categories are intrinsically tied to Cyril's soteriologically and liturgically grounded insight into Christ as the high priest and mediator. Cyril did not overreact to the subordinationism of the "Arians". Unlike some theologians before and after him, Cyril did not succumb to the temptation to de-emphasize the high priestly prayer-mediation of Christ which he saw as the basis for our worship of the Father. On the contrary, he allowed it and all it implied to inform and govern his Christology.

Thus, I cannot conclude, as Ezra Gebremedhin does, that Cyril's idea of the hypostatic union underlines his understanding of the eucharistic liturgy and that Cyril applied a previously constructed Christology to his theology of worship and eucharist.[51] Gebremedhin's view of the relationship between Cyril's Christology and theology of the eucharist assumes that Cyril worked out a Christology apart from his understanding of Christian worship. But Cyril no more worked out a

---

[51] See Gebremedhin, "Life-Giving Blessing," 12, 69. One weakness of Gebremedhin's presentation of Cyril's theology of the eucharist is that it does not take into account the historical development of Cyril's thought. Gebremedhin admits that Cyril never explicitly referred to the hypostatic union before the Nestorian controversy. But Gebremedhin overlooks the fact that Cyril's theology of the eucharist was well in place before the Nestorian crisis. Thus it cannot be maintained that Cyril's idea of the hypostatic union was the basis for his understanding of the eucharist.

Christology apart from his understanding of the eucharistic liturgy anymore than he constructed a Christology apart from his soteriological concerns. This study of Cyril's thought in the *Commentary on John* shows that Cyril was concerned not for abstract speculations about the "person" and "natures" of Christ, but for the possibility of salvation and for the liturgy by which this salvation is communicated to the body of which Christ, as second Adam, is the Head. This salvation for Cyril is recapitulation, the heading up of humanity under the risen Christ. This recapitulation (ἀνακεφαλαιώσις) is present and actual in the world, in history, through the celebration of the eucharist. In other words, the risen Christ and the salvation that he brings is mediated through the church's sacramental worship. Furthermore, to the extent that Cyril's Christology is governed and based by his soteriological concerns it is also governed and based by his understanding of Christian worship. For Cyril, any Christology that cannot acknowledge Jesus as the second Adam and as the eternal Son of God who emptied himself into flesh order to offer to the Father the worship we are unable to give, cannot account for salvation or the way in which it is communicated.

For Cyril, Christ's role as high priest and mediator reveals who Christ is. We know who Christ is because of his work in the historical economy of salvation -he is the Son who emptied himself out into the likeness of sinful flesh, who proved himself the second Adam, the head of the body, the church. This in turn means that the unity of Christ and the communication of idioms are soteriologically and liturgically required. If they are denied then the event of salvation is mediated through a mere man or it is mediated through a semi-divine creature. In other words, to refuse the unity of Christ or the communication of idioms is to refuse the historical revelation and salvation in Christ and the worship of the Church where this salvation is encountered.

Chapter 5: Christ, Recapitulation, and Creation.

We have seen that Cyril frequently refers to humanity's salvation in Christ as a restoration and return to the beginning or to the original state throughout his *Commentary on John.*[1] This restoration of humanity to its original state raises the question of how, for Cyril, the new state in Christ is different from humanity's state before the fall [the original state or condition] It also raises the question of what Adam fell away from. Furthermore, Cyril's affirmation about humanity's return to its original state lays bare a delicate theological issue: Christ's role in creation. A number of scholars, while acknowledging Cyril's frequent references to salvation as restoration to humanity's original state, maintain that Cyril consistently sought to underline the discontinuity between the old creation and the new creation. According to this view Cyril saw salvation in Christ as a new and better state than the first, or in the words of one scholar as "recapitulation but with increase, addition".[2]

---

[1] See Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.2, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 142; *In Joannem,* v.1, 184); Bk.9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 316; *In Joannem,* v.2, 482 [twice]); Bk.9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 320; *In Joannem,* v.2, 486) Bk. 5, Ch.2 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 547; *In Joannem,* v.2, 691). See also *Glaphyra in Genesim,* Bk.1, see P.G. 69, 16CD; *De sancta trinitate dialogi,* vi, 22.10-15 (Sources chrétiennes, ed. G. M. Durand, v.246, Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1978). The references above are only a sampling.

[2] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man,* 115. Burghardt claims that this increase is "a root kinship with God effected by the physical entrance of the Incarnate Word into humanity". This claim is examined and discussed below. Wilken admits that Cyril often claims that in Christ humanity is renewed to what it was in the beginning but argues that Cyril also claimed that the new state in

This presentation of Cyril's thought is not without problems. It is very difficult say precisely, how, for Cyril the state of redemption in Christ is better than the state of humanity before the fall. It is equally difficult to identify exactly what is the nature of the increase or addition that is supposedly given in recapitulation according to Cyril. Perhaps more significantly, this view of Cyril's thought overlooks, or does not do justice to, evidence in Cyril's work which suggests that the bishop of Alexandria saw humanity's life in Christ as the restoration of what Adam lost in the fall and the restoration of what the Father had given humanity from the beginning. There are passages in his works where Cyril speculates that the human race was blessed and created not in the pre-human Logos but in Christ and that humanity's fall was a fall away from Christ.[3] In other words, there is evidence that Cyril's emphasis upon the historical Christ and his insistence upon locating the mediating activity in the Son's incarnate state, led him to struggle with

Christ is better. Wilken cites two passages from the *Commentary on Isaiah* (P.G. 70: 961b; 965b) in this regard and contends that despite affirmations to the contrary Cyril "does not mean a *return* to the original state, but a new state brought about through Christ". See Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind,* 90, n.60. G.M. Durand acknowledges that Cyril speaks on several occasions of Christ restoring humanity to its original state, but argues that Cyril does not pursue this line of thought at any great length. See Durand, *Deux dialogues christologique,* Sources chrétiennes, v.97 (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1964) 91-92. While Cyril may not have speculated at any great length *about the implications* of salvation as a return to the original state, it is not accurate to say that Cyril *never* speculated about the implications of salvation as a restoration to humanity's original condition. Cyril's lack of speculation in this vein, this does not diminish the importance of the numerous texts where Cyril does in fact describe salvation as a restoration of this sort. Scholars have not paid sufficent attention to these texts nor have they noticed that certain aspects of Cyril 's thought have a great affinity with this idea of salvation as the return to humanity's beginning prior to the fall.

[3] Dominic Unger is one of the few scholars to notice that Cyril entertained the question of Christ's role in creation. In 1947 Unger wrote three articles (see "Christ Jesus the Secure Foundation according to Cyril of Alexandria," *Franciscan Studies* 7 (1947): 1-25; 324-343; 399-414) investigating the writings of Cyril in order to:

> ascertain whether they have anything in favor of the Franciscan doctrine that Christ was predestined for his own glory before all creation, and so *a fortiori* before the sin of Adam was foreseen; and that he was predestined to be the Final Scope and Exemplar and Mediator of all creatures.

Unger argued that the thought of Cyril is in agreement with the Scotist doctrine that the incarnation did not depend upon the fall. He assumed that Cyril was a systematic thinker and seemed to suppose that Cyril rigorously upheld his sometime affirmation of a creation in Christ. Unger noted that at least two other Franciscans besides himself have written of the absolute primacy of Christ as found in the writings of Cyril. M. Risi, *Sul motivo primario dell' Incarnazione del Verbo* (Rome: Desclée, 1889); Jules Basetti Sani, "La docttrina del Primato di Gesu Cristo in S. Cirillo"*Kyrilliana,* Etudes Variées à l'occasion du XV cent. de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie (Guizeh, Egypte: Séminaire Franciscan Oriental, 1947); Add to this R. Rosini "Il primogenitio in S. Cirillo Alessandrino,". *Studia Patavina* 12 (1965) 32-64.

the problem of Christ's relation to creation "from the beginning". This whole question after Nicea was a delicate one because the "Arians" had located the nature of the Son entirely on the side of creation. The "Arians" cited Prov 8:22-25 as proof that the Son was a creature. Any Nicene theologian who entertained the question of Christ's relation to creation ran the risk of being trapped into saying the that the Son was a creature from the Father. While Cyril, of course, never dropped his insistence that the divinity of Christ was uncreated, he did in fact explicitly speculate about Christ's role in regard to creation and the fall. He grappled with the problem of creation as a Christian mystery that really has something to do with Christ. Secondly, on a more subtle level, the logic of Cyril's thought with reference to the divine image in humanity and adoptive sonship also has a great affinity with this christocentric emphasis upon creation and the fall.

It is my view that in Cyril's thought there is very little to distinguish the state of humanity before the fall and the state of humanity after its renewal in Christ. What I believe this indicates is that Cyril at times applied to creation, albeit inconsistently, his emphasis upon the Son as mediating in his incarnate state. Cyril is not a rigorously systematic thinker and his Christology has problems and inconsistencies. But he is also not a thinker who makes completely arbitrary claims which are unrelated to one another.

This chapter will explore Cyril's speculation in regard to relationship between Christ and creation. It is my contention that Cyril's views on the divine image in humanity, adoptive sonship and the restoration of humanity to the "original state" have a strong proclivity with Cyril's speculation about a creation in Christ and a fall from Christ. The chapter does not purport to be exhaustive with respect to these points in the thought of Cyril, and it is certainly not the last word. Nevertheless, this chapter does point out an aspect of Cyril's thought that is easy to overlook.

A) Christ as the Foundation of Creation

We have seen that Cyril was a bishop-theologian who was not afraid to speculate and to offer new answers to some old questions and problems. Cyril pondered about the relationship of Christ to creation even in one of his Easter

homilies. In *Homilia Paschalis* 30, Cyril speaks of the mystery of Christ as ancient:

> *Do not think that the ancient Law was decreed by God as if it were sufficient to free anyone from the charges of infirmity; but that when he missed the goal, he thought up the way that is faith by Christ -- as if using a plan thought up later. He did not do it that way. Far from it.* On the contrary, you can be sure that even before the first man was entirely formed from the earth, God, not being ignorant of the things to come, and of the ambushes of the devil's perversity, provided the manner of our cure beforehand; namely the mystery of Christ, then he made the Law which is through Moses and which should convict sin and denounce the infirmity that permeated all, and wisely proclaim the command that condemned, before the grace of justification, so that grace might abound still more ...*That the mystery of Christ is ancient we shall easily perceive, for this the sacred letters tell us.* For the blessed Paul says somewhere "Blessed be God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who blessed us with every spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ; accordingly he has chosen us in him before the foundation (καταβολῆς) of the world; having pre-destined us for adoption through Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, he has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world." ... You hear, then how he says we were blessed even before the constitution of the world, how he pre-ordained us to be sons in Jesus Christ.?[4]

It is certainly clear in this passage that Cyril considered humanity's blessing and adoption in Christ as something predestined from the beginning. This predestination was an important feature of the Father's creation. For according to Cyril the Father foresaw the fall and provided the cure beforehand. Thus Christ is not a divine afterthought. On the contrary, the mystery of Christ is ancient. The Alexandrian bishop is so intent on making this affirmation that he goes on to say later in this homily that "the mystery of Christ existed even before the law". There is reason to believe that Cyril did not understand the ancient mystery of Christ and the cure for the fall which the Father provided beforehand only as ideas or designs in the mind of the Father.

Several passages in the *Thesaurus* show how Cyril struggled with the "ancient mystery of Christ" and the relationship of Christ to creation. Throughout the *Thesaurus* Cyril answers objections or proofs based on Prov 8:22 ("The Lord created me the beginning of his work") against the eternity of the Son. Scholars such as Liébaert[5] and Wilken[6] have argued that Cyril's answers to these objections,

---

[4] Cyril, *Homilia Paschalis,* 30 (P.G. 77, 974) Emphasis mine. I follow Unger's translation. Cyril quotes Eph 1:3-5 in the passage cited above. Cyril speaks in the same way in *Glaphyra in Exodum,* Bk.1, P.G. 69, 424B.

closely follow those of Athanasius in the *Contra Arianos* albeit with a few minor variations. Arguing against those who use Prov 8:22 to claim that the Son is a creature, Cyril distinguishes between the old creation and the new creation that comes about through the resurrection of Christ and claims that Prov 8:22 and Col 1:15 (which speaks of Christ as the firstborn all creation) refers to the Christ at the new creation rather than to a temporal generation of the Logos at the first creation. The Logos is said to be created in the sense that he is the beginning of a new creation. Wilken notices that Cyril, like Athanasius, argues that the word "create" in the scriptures does not always refer to generation of the essence of something but also refers to re-creation or renovation.[7]

Wilken is certainly right in pointing out that in numerous passages the *Thesaurus* Cyril follows Athanasius by insisting that Prov 8:22 only applies to the incarnate Logos in the new creation. But toward the end of assertio 15 in the *Thesaurus* Cyril goes beyond this explanation and beyond the solution of the Athanasius. He takes up an objection from the "heretics" based upon Prov 8:22-25: "The Lord created me the beginning his ways for his works. He established me before the ages in the beginning, before he made the earth; even before he made the depths; before the fountains of waters came forth; before the mountains were settled, before all hills he begets me". How, the "heretics" object, can Prov 8:23-25 refer to the incarnate Logos when it is written that the Logos was created even before the earth was made and the mountains were settled? Cyril and the "heretics" agreed on at least one point: Wisdom in Proverbs refers to the Logos. The Alexandrian patriarch finds himself in something of a bind here and is forced to admit that the troublesome passage from Proverbs does refer to something about the old creation. For Cyril it cannot mean that the Son is created insofar as he is divine. He argues that this difficult passage in Proverbs does refer to the Incarnate Logos but with a new twist. Christ has something to do with the old

---

[5] Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique*, 31.

[6] Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*, 171-173. Wilken's interest in Cyril's interpretation of this passage is within the wider perspective of Cyril's theology of the new creation. Wilken argued that for Cyril the idea of the new creation was situated in a much broader perspective and was not limited to the Trinitarian dispute about the creation of the son. On this see Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*, 173-180 especially with regard to the way Cyril uses the notion of the new creation with regard to the relationship between Judaism and Christianity.

[7] Ibid., 171. Wilken cites the *Thesaurus*, P.G. 75, 280 BC.

creation as well as the new. Cyril's reply to the "heretics" is two-fold. He argues that even before the creation of the world, the Father foreknew and intended Christ to be the beginning of his ways in whom the human race was to be founded. Secondly, Cyril goes on to argue that the human race was created in Christ. After admitting that the objection of his interlocutor is a difficult one Cyril writes:

> He [the Father] founded his Son before the ages, as far as his foreknowledge is concerned, that we having been built upon him might rise again unto incorruption - we who had fallen into corruption through the transgression. For he knew that we would die because of sin ... When he who is maker and creator of all things planned beforehand the things concerning us he foresaw preordained him who was to be man because of us and for us,who was also to be the beginning of ways and to be founded as the foundation - the nature of man having been renewed unto incorruption in him, and to be called thefirst fruit of many brethren, and to rise as first fruits of those who slept.[8]

To support his claim that before the ages the Father foreknew and founded Christ to be the foundation upon which the human race would be built Cyril goes on to cite 2 Tim 1:8-10 "... but suffer evils along with the gospel according to the power of God; who saved us not according to our works but according to his own purpose and grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus before the ages of ages." Cyril also cites Eph 1:3-5 "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in the heavens in Christ; accordingly he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, to be holy and blameless before him in love, he predestined us for adoption through Jesus Christ according to the good will pleasure of his will." Cyril understands the Father's foreknowledge and purpose as a grace given to humanity. He goes on to indicate that this grace given to humanity in Christ was not only an idea in the mind of the Father. The bishop of Alexandria writes:

> God the Father, foreknowing what would be advantageous for human nature, and knowing that human nature would fall completely into corruption; seeking, however, a manner of raising it up and of bringing it to incorruption, he planted the roots of such hope in his Son, and pre-ordained us to adoption through him; and made us worthy of every spiritual blessing, even though we not yet born, *so that whenever it happen that we fall into death because of the transgression we might again blossom again from the original root, (ἀρχαίας ῥίζης) unto life, and, as having been blessed beforehand* we would not come completely under the curse

[8] Cyril, *Thesaurus*, 15 (P.G. 75, 292 BC). I follow Unger's translation "Christ Jesus the Secure Foundation according to Cyril of Alexandria," 4.

> on hearing "you are earth and unto earth you shall return". Beforehand, Christ lays down our foundation upon which in him we are all built, and this before the foundation of the world by virtue of the foreknowledge of God who sees all things, so that, as I have already stated, we might have the blessing that is older- than the curse; *the promise of life that is older than the condemnation of death; the liberation of adoption that is older than the servitude of the devil. Our nature returned to the beginning ('Ανατρέχει δὲ ἡ φύσις εἰς τὸ ἀρχαιον), having overcome what later befell it, by the grace of him who established it in Christ in good things,* and it becomes again what it was in the foreknowledge of God, being ordained by the Son out of love all that is best.[9]

First of all, it should pointed out that when Cyril speaks of the Son in this passage he means Christ not the non-human Logos. This clear from Cyril's claim that "beforehand, *Christ* lays down our foundation upon which in him we are all built ..." Cyril is perfectly willing to refer the "Logos bare of humanity" or the "Logos before the incarnation" in numerous other passages in his works but he does not do that here.[10] He gives no reason to believe in this passage that he uses the term Son in order to refer to the non-human Son and the term Christ to refer to the Son who is the God-man. With this in mind it should also be noticed that Cyril makes a distinction here between the Father's foreknowledge of what would be advantageous for humanity and the foreknowledge of the fall and the manner of raising humanity up.[11] Thus it seems that the Father willed the "advantages" for humanity before the fall. These advantages have to do with being blessed in

---

[9] Τὰ συμφέροντα τῇ ἀνθρώπου φύσει προνοήσας ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ, καὶ γινώσκων μὲν ὅτι πεσειται πάτως εἰς φθορὰν, τρόπον δὲ αυτη ζητὴσας ἀναεώσεως καὶ της εἰς ἀφθαπσιαν ἐπανόδου, ῥιζας ὥσπερ αύτη της τοιαύρτης ἐλπιδος ἐν τω ἰδίω κατεβαλετο γεννήματι, καὶ εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ημας προοριζει δι ' αὐτου, καὶ πάσηας εὐλογιας πνευματικης αξιοι, καίτοι οὕτω γενομένους· ἴν'ὅταν συμβη πεσαιν εἰς θάνατονδιὰ τὴν παράβασιν, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀραχαἰς ῥιζης πάλιν εἰς ζωὴν αναβλαστήση. καὶ ως ἤδη ποευλογηθεισα, μὴ παντελως ὑπὸ τὴν κατὰραν γένηται, ὅταν ἀκουση· (Γη εἰ, καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύση) Προθεμελιουται τοίνυν ἡμυων ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ τουτο πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου κατὰ πρόγνωσιν του πάντα ειδότος Θεου· ἵνα, καθάπερ ἤδη προείπομεν, ἀρχαιοτέραν ἔχωμεν τῆς κατάρας τὴν εὐλογίας, καὶ τῆς εἰς τον θάνατον καταδίκης, τὴς εἰς ζωὴν ὑπὸσχεσιν, καὶ της ἐκ του διαβόλου δουλείας, της υἱοθεσιας τὴς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν. 'Ανατρέ'χει δὲ ἡ φούσις εἰς τὸ ἀρχαιον, τὰ μεταξὺ συμβεβηκότα νικήσασα, διὰ τὴν χὰριν του θεμελιώσαντος αὐτὴν ἐν ἀγαθοἶς ἐν Χριστω, καὶ πάλιν ἐκεινο γίεται ὅπερ ἦν ἐν προγνώσει του Θεου, ἐξ ἀγάπης προοριζομένη πρὸς πάντα τὰ κάλλιστα δἰ Υἱου.

Cyril, *Thesaurus*, assertio 15 (P.G. 75 293 D) I have re-worked Unger's translation. Emphasis is mine.

[10] See for example *Commentary on John* Bk 2, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey v.1, 138-139); Bk 2 Ch..5 (tr. Pusey v.1, 218); See Bk 9 (tr. Pusey v.2, 237) where Cyril speaks of the Logos bare of humanity (γυμνὸς ἀνθρωπότητος). These citations are only a sampling.

[11] Unger has pointed this out in "Christ Jesus the Secure Foundation According to Cyril of Alexandria,"5-6.

Christ. Cyril speaks here of humanity having been given these advantages so that it "might again sprout, as from the *original root,* unto life." Cyril's description of Christ as humanity's *original root* is significant. When Cyril uses the metaphor of the *root* in conjunction with Christ elsewhere in his work it is in reference to the second or the new creation. In that context the Alexandrian bishop refers to Christ as the second root of humanity[12] and as the root of the renewed and incorruptible human nature.[13] Cyril clearly pursues a different line of thought in our passage and offers a new answer to an old problem. He speaks of the Son as the *original root* in regard to the first creation as well as to the second creation. The Son is the *original root* of humanity from the beginning and is the *root* from which humanity blossoms from again after the fall. A computer generated search of Cyril's entire corpus shows that the passage above is the only one where Cyril refers to the Son as humanity's *original root* (ἀρχαίας ῥίζης).[14] It is within this whole emphasis upon the Son as the *original root* from whom humanity blossoms and reblossoms that Cyril claims that humanity's restoration after the fall from the first creation is a return to that beginning. In the same way it is said that humanity's blessing in Christ is a blessing that is older than the curse, the promise of life is older than the condemnation of death and the liberation of adoption is older than the servitude of the devil. Unless these blessings in Christ, the *original root,* were something given to humanity actually and concretely before the fall, not only as ideas in the mind of the Father, Cyril could hardly assert that the blessings are older than the curse or that the Son is the *original root* from whom humanity blossoms again. This interpretation of this passage in the *Thesaurus* seems justified given what Cyril goes on to claim in assertio 15. He writes:

> It is necessary that we see how the wisdom of God provided our salvation before the ages. As when some wise architect beginning the building (κατασκευῆς) of a house, and planning, as is proper, that it may not suffer as time goes on the things that happen to buildings, *lays down a very firm foundation having in mind an unshakable root for his works, that should it suffer anything, since the*

[12] See *Glaphyra in Genesim,* P.G. 69, Bk.1, 28D; Bk. 2, P.G. 69, 172B; Bk.4, P.G. 69, 205. *De sancta trinitate dialogi,* vi, 22.10-15, (Sources chrétiennes ed. G. M. Durand, v.246, Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1978)

[13] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk. 5, Ch.2 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 549-550; *In Joannem,* v.1, 694-695); This is also the sense of *Glaphyra in Genesim,* P.G. 69, Bk.1, 28D where Christ is said to be the second root who returns humanity to its former incorruptibility.

[14] This search was done through the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae project. TLG has entered Cyril's works on CD ROM.

beginning being saved it can be rebuilt. In the same way the creator of all things laid down Christ beforehand as the foundation of our salvation, even before the building (και πρὸ της του κόσμου κατασκευῆς) *of the world, so that when it should happen that we should fall because of the transgression, that afterwards we could be rebuilt upon him* (αυθις ἐπ αὐτη καὶ ἀνακτισθωμεν επ' αὐτω.) As far as the Father's design and purpose goes, Christ was also founded before the ages; but the work to place in proper time, as the matter required. For we are renewed in Christ according to the time of his sojourn, though we had him beforehand as the foundation of our salvation.[15]

In this passage humanity's foundation and establishment in Christ is not simply an idea in the Father's mind. Cyril argues here that Christ the God-man is founded by the Father before the fall and that humanity's foundation in Christ was something that actually occurred before the fall. It is upon this foundation in Christ that humanity is re-created. The Father is a wise architect who from the beginning creates humanity upon Christ who is a firm foundation, the "unshakable root for the Father's works." The illustration that Cyril uses here shows that he considers Christ to be the foundation before the fall just as a building is prior to its destruction. This is what Cyril means when he says "that should it suffer anything, *the beginning being saved, it can be built anew.*" It is upon the foundation of Christ, the unshakable root, that the human race is re-built "for we are renewed in Christ according to the time of his earthly sojourn, though we had him before hand as the foundation of our salvation." The fall of humanity in this scheme is a fall away from Christ. For Cyril creation does not start off fallen.[16] The building

[15] Πως ἡμιν προθεμελιουται ἡ του Θεου σοφια τρὸ του αἰωνος, ἀναγκαιον ἰδειν. Ωσπερ εἴ τις ἀρχιτέκων σοφὸς οἴκου κατασκευης ἀρχὸμενος ἐννοήσας τε, κατὰ τόεἰκὸς, μή τι ἄρα καὶ πὰθοι, προιόντος του χρόνου, των ὅσα πέφυκε γίνεσθαι περὶ τὰς των οἰκοδομημάτων κατασκευὰς, θεμέλιον ἀῤῥαγη καταβάλλεται, καὶ ῥίζαν ὥσπερ ἀκλόνητον τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπινοεῖ, ἵν εἴ τι καὶ πάθοι σωζομένην ἔοντα τὴν ἀρχην, αὖθις ἐπ' αὐτη καὶ ἀναστηναι δυνηθη· τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον ὁ πάντων δημιουργὸς, της ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας προθεμελίωσε τὸν χριστὸν, καὶ πρὸ της του κόσμου κατασκευῆς, ἵν' ἐπειδήπερ συμβη πεσειν διὰ τὴν παράβασιν, αὖθις ἀνακτισθωμεν ἐπ' αὐτω. οσον μὲν οὖν εἰς βουλὴν τε καὶ πρόθεσιν του Πατρὸς, καὶ πρὸ του αἰωνος θεμελιουται Χριστός· τὸ δέ γε ἔρνον οἰκείω γέγονε καιρω, ὅυτως ἀπαιτούσης της χρέας του πράγματος.' Ανανεούμεθα γὰρ ἐν Χριστω κατὰ τὸν της ἐπιδημίας καιρὸν, οἱ καὶ πάλαι της σωτηρίας αὐτὸν θεμέλιον ἔχοντες.

Cyril, *Thesaurus,* assertio 15, PG 75, 296

[16] Walter Burghardt noticed that Cyril maintained that Adam enjoyed the gift of bodily incorruptibility prior to fall. See Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man,* 96-98. Burghardt cites in this regard Cyril's *Contra Julianum,* Bk.3 (PG 76, 637); *De dogmatum solutione,* 7. He also cites the *Commentary on John,* Bk.12, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 686) where Cyril says that the resurrection of the body will be in power and glory and will return to its original creation; To this I would add the *Commentary on John,* Bk.9, Ch.1, (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 318-319) where Cyril speaks of the

exists before it falls away from its foundation. Cyril's claim about the human race being rebuilt and renewed upon its foundation, which is Christ, is perfectly consistent with his emphasis upon Christ as returning humanity to the beginning.

If we compare Cyril's comments with those of Athanasius it is clear that Cyril does not simply repeat the solution of his master. In *Contra Arianos* II sections 75-78, Athanasius argues against the "Arian" interpretation of Prov 8:22-25 contending that the words "before the world", and "before the mountains were settled" should not be interpreted to mean that the Logos is a creature. During the course of his argument against the "Arians", Athanasius makes use of the metaphor of the wise architect and the building to make his point. He writes:

> And as a wise architect proposing to build a house plans also about renewing it, should it at any time become dilapidated after building, and, as planning about this makes preparation and gives to the workmen the means for renewal; and thus the means for renewal are provided before the house (καί γίνεται πρὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἡ τῆς αναεώσεως προπαρασκευή); in the same way prior to us is the renewal of our salvation founded in Christ that in him we might be renewed. And the will and the purpose were made ready "before the world", but have taken effect when the need required, and the Savior came among us. For the Lord himself will stand us in place of all things in the heavens, when he receive us into everlasting life. This then suffices to prove that the Word of God is not a creature, but that the sense of passage is right.[17]

In this passage Athanasius tries to explain Prov 8:22-25 mainly in terms of idea in the Father's foreknowledge of humanity's salvation in Christ. We have seen that Cyril does not reject this solution but includes it in his own answer to the "Arian" interpretation of Prov 8:22-25. On the other hand, there are some important differences between Cyril and Athanasius. Cyril is open to seeing Prov 8:22-25 as referring to more than ideas in the Father's foreknowledge at the first creation. For the human race to be predestined for Christ also means that humanity is actually created in Christ from the beginning. While Athanasius speaks of the means of renewal as furnished before the house he does not speak of Christ as the foundation and unshakable root upon which humanity is built and then rebuilt. Nor does Athanasius think of Christ as the firm foundation from which humanity

---

creation of the first man.

[17] Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, II, Ch. 22. 75. I have re-worked the translation that appears in *The Select Library of the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff, tr. J.H. Newman and Archibald Robinson, v.4, (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1892; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 390.

fell away from. Cyril, unlike Athanasius, emphasizes the architect as wise because he builds upon an unshakable root that will remain intact and be suitable for re-building should the building fall. This emphasis is completely absent in the material Cyril inherited from Athanasius.

Once again, Cyril takes material from Athanasius and carefully re-works to suit his own purposes. He can repeat the solution of Athanasius and yet at the same time skillfully go beyond it and give a new answer to an old problem. All this yet another instance of how Cyril deepened Athanasius' insight that theology's starting point of Christian theology had to do with the historical Christ rather than a time before the Son was man or speculation about the nature of the pre-human Son's divinity. It is the divine Son who is also man who mediates the divine life to humanity. In the passages examined above Cyril applies this insight in regard to creation. Whenever Cyril speaks of the human race as created in or upon Christ, this is nothing less than a radical realization of his usual insistence that the mediating activity of Son cannot restricted to his divinity.

Cyril certainly does not consistently uphold the idea of a creation in and a fall from Christ. Nevertheless, the logic of his thought with respect to creation in the divine image and the gifts of incorruptibility, and adoptive sonship has more in common with a christocentric perspective than a non-christocentric one where humanity is created through a non-human Son. The logic of Cyril's thought in these matters seems to suppose that the mystery of salvation is not remote or isolated from creation because salvation restores and returns humanity to what the Father created humanity for in the beginning: to live in Christ through the Spirit. Thus there appears to be very little that distinguishes the original state of humanity before the fall, from the redeemed condition of humanity. All this of course is perfectly consistent with Cyril frequent claim that the *anakephalaiosis,* involves humanity being restored and returned to its beginning.

B) Christ and the Divine Image in Humanity: The Opinion of Walter Burghardt

Walter Burghardt was the last scholar to have examined at some length the whole question of the precise shape and nature of the renewed condition of humanity and its relationship to the original creation in the thought of Cyril. In his

fine study, *The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria,* Burghardt argued that for Cyril, Adam imaged the Trinity because he was free, rational, holy, incorruptible, and possessed dominion over the earth. During the course his examination of Cyril's understanding of the divine image in man, Burghardt addressed the issue of the differences between the redeemed condition of humanity and the original state of humanity before the fall as well as the delicate question of the relationship of Christ to the divine image in humanity. Burghardt explored these issues especially in reference to what Cyril himself considered to be the most the two of the most significant aspects of the divine image in humanity: incorruptibility and adoptive sonship. He maintained that for Cyril there was a significant difference between the primitive state of Adam and the redeemed condition. Burghardt claimed that the redeemed state was "recapitulation but with the increase and addition: a root kinship with God effected by the physical entrance of the incarnate Word into humanity."[18] Secondly, in the redeemed condition, humanity receives through the mediation of Christ the Spirit of adoption which makes humans being sons of God by grace. Burghardt argued that "concretely our advantage over Adam is determined by the respective bases on which his condition and our have been constructed: creation and incarnation."[19]

It is my view that not the evidence that Burghardt cited in this regard points to a greater unity between original creation and the new creation in the thought of Cyril than Burghardt noticed. Furthermore, Cyril's christocentricism informed his views on the divine image in humanity, the incorruptibility of the body, and adoptive sonship to a greater degree than Burghardt observed. What follows below can only be an introduction into these aspects of Cyril's thought. One other point is in order. Modern Cyrillian scholars, including myself, will always owe an unpayable debt of thanks to Walter Burghardt's research and analysis of an important area of Cyril's thought. My criticisms of some of his positions and conclusions should only be interpreted as a testimony and a tribute to the great impetus that his work has generated.

Burghardt recognized that there are Christocentric texts in Cyril's works and even Christocentric emphases in Cyril's thought but, he is firm in his conclusion that they do not undermine what he understands to be Cyril's overall view. He

[18] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man,* 115

[19] Ibid.

admits that there are many passages where Cyril says that we are made, or re-made, into the image and likeness of Christ[20] and he is also aware of Cyril's constant insistence upon the fact that Christ restores the human race to its beginning or original state. Cyril's claim that human creatures are remade into the image and likeness of Christ is important because at the very least it raises the question of Christ's relation to the divine image in humanity. Burghardt argued that when Cyril's asserts that humanity is re-created in the likeness of Christ, this is not the view of Irenaeus who, he believes, taught that the Father created Adam in the image of the incarnate Logos and that the whole human nature of Adam, body and soul, imaged God.[21] Moreover, Burghardt observed:

> Cyril does not, of course, deny that the Son of God became man like us in perfect humanity. He will not challenge the fact that all men without exception are conformed (συμμόρφους) to Christ by reason of the human nature common to them and to Him. But this is not the divine image of scripture and theology, Cyril sees it. The image texts of the New Testament (Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 3:17-18; Col 3:10; cf Gal 4:19) do not refer to a graving of Christ in us after the flesh. Our transfiguration to Christ is spiritual, a supernatural thing; we are images of divinity. Cyril scouts as "highly ridiculous" the notion that reformation to our Lord involves some corporeal remodeling. Our participation of the Son has reference to Him inasmuch as He is God. "For Christ is formed in us, not as created in created, but as Uncreated and God in created and produced nature, engraving us anew in His own image through the Spirit, and transferring the creature, that is, us, to the dignity that is above the creature." Our specific imaging of God's Son comes down to this, that we have become sons of God.[22]

Burghardt's claim here, that for Cyril our transfiguration to Christ is spiritual and does not involve the "flesh" because we are images of divinity, is not

---

[20] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 23. Burghardt cites as examples *In Isaiam* 4,5 P.G. 70, 1121-24; Cyril's remarks on Mt 24:36 *In Matthaeum*, (P.G. 72, 444-445) which Burghardt translates as follows: "For we were made like Him, when he was made like us"; *Commentary on John*, Bk.12, Ch.1 (*In Joannem*, v.3, 122-123)

[21] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 17. Burghardt cites *Adversus Haereses*, 5, 16, 1 in this regard and the interpretation of E. Klebba, *Die Anthropologie des hl. Irenaeus*, (Munster, 1894), 23-25 and E. Peterson "L'Immagine di Dio in S. Ireneo" *Scuola cattolica* 19 (1941) 3-11. Whether this interpretation is correct is a question that lies beyond the scope of my study.

[22] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 23. Burghardt quotes here *De sancta et consubstantiali trinitate*, dial.4 (P.G. 75, 904-905). I follow his translation. For the critical edition see *Dialogues Sur La Trinité*, Sources chrétienne, v.237, ed. G.M. Durand (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1977) 218, hereafter cited as *Dialogues Sur La Trinité*. It should also be pointed out here that Burghardt realizes that in *De Dogmatum solutione* 4, Cyril uses the terms "image of Christ" and "impress of the divine nature" indiscriminately. But Burghardt does not develop the significance or import of this language.

altogether consistent. He implies that Cyril understood "spiritual" to be immaterial and that the divine image in humanity is wholly immaterial. Burghardt later concedes that there is a difficulty with the claim that the divine imaging does not involve the body, because Cyril repeatedly insists that Christ recovers the bodily incorruptibility which was lost in the fall and that this the incorruptibility of the whole person, body and soul, is an important aspect of the divine imaging.[23] Insofar as the body is free from corruption it reflects the perishability and incorruptibility of God. Burghardt recognizes that Cyril holds that at the general resurrection the bodies of the just, transformed and made partakers of the risen glorified body of Christ, will definitively image Christ.[24] Thus the body is an essential component in this imaging of Christ for Cyril. On the one hand, acknowledging that against the anthropomorphists Cyril asserted that the divine image was found in the soul Burghardt writes:

> On the other hand, he makes it clear that the immortality and incorruptibility recovered for us by the Incarnate Word in his resurrection and definitively

[23] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 84, 91-101. In reference to incorruptibility as an important aspect of the divine image Burghardt cites the *Commentary on John,* Bk.9, Ch.1 (*In Joannem,* v.2, 484)

> So then, this rational animal upon the earth, I mean man, was made in the beginning" to the image of the Creator," as Scripture has it (Col 3:10). Now, the idea of the image is a varied one; for there is not just one way of being an image; there are many. Nevertheless, the part of the likeness (ἐμφερίας) to the Creator which is most remarkable (διαφανέστατον) is incorruptibility and imperishability (τὸ ἄφθαρτον καί ἀνώλαθρον). But I do not think that the [rational] animal was ever sufficient of itself, by reason of its own nature, to achieve that state of things; for how would the man from earth have been able to boast of incorruptibility (ἀφθαρίας) in his own nature, and not have received this blessing, like the rest, from the God who is incorruptible and imperishable by nature? For "what have you that you did not received?" (1Cor 4:7) ... And so, in order that what had been brought into being from nonbeing might not return to its own origin and go back to nothingness, that it might rather be preserved perpetually - for this was the Creator's purpose - God made him a partaker (μέτοχον) of His own nature; for "He breathed into his face the breath of life" (Gn 2:7), that is, the Spirit of the Son; for He is Himself Life with the Father; He holds all things in being. In Him, you see, the beings that are capable of life move and live, as Paul says (cf. Acts 17:28).

I follow Burghardt's translation. Cf. *Commentary on John,* Bk. 9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 318; *In Joannem,* v.2, 484) Cyril obviously includes the incorruptibility of the body here. Burghardt at 91 argues rightly that Cyril's emphasis upon the incorruptibility of the body rather than the soul is so frequent that "it would be tedious and pointless to document this statement mathematically." On the other hand, Burghardt thinks that there is a defect in Cyril's presentation because he does not relate his claim that the incorruptible bodies image God and his claim against the anthropomorphists that the image of God is to located exclusively in the soul.

[24] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 165, Burghardt cites *In epistolem 2 ad Corinthios,* Bk 2, Ch.1; (The edition referred to is in Pusey, *In Joannem,* 3, 339); *De recta fide, ad dominas,* 134 (ACO 1, 1, 1, 5, 95.) Also see *Dogmatum solutione,* Bk.3 (Pusey, *In Joannem,* 3, 556-557).

> communicated to us in our resurrection includes the body as an essential element: *the participated incorruptibility of the whole man, soul and body, is a reflection of the incorruptibility that is native to God.*[25]

But this means that for Cyril at the resurrection of Christ there is the restoration of the divine image in man at the very least as it bears upon the aspect of incorruptibility including that of the body. All this is difficult to reconcile with Burghardt's claim that, when Cyril speaks of human creatures being remade in Christ, this re-creation does not refer to the divine image because that imaging, for Cyril, is not a "graving in Christ in us after the flesh". Burghardt's presentation of Cyril's thought runs into difficulties here. If for Cyril the body is an essential element in the human imaging of Christ and images the incorruptibility that is native to God, then one cannot also claim that Cyril's assertions about the making and remaking in the likeness of Christ have nothing to do with his concept of the divine image because our transfiguration in Christ is "spiritual" understood in the sense of immaterial.[26] Secondly, if this transfiguration in Christ includes the body then it does not follow for Cyril, as Burghardt contends, that our transfiguration to Christ and "our participation in the Son has reference to him inasmuch as he is God."[27] On the contrary the renewal of the divine image in man with respect to

---

[25] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man,* 100. Emphasis mine.

[26] I am not convinced that when Cyril says in *De recta fide ad Theodosium,* 36 (ACO 1, 1, 1, 36; as cited by Burghardt) that it is ridiculous to think that reformation in Christ entails a corporeal remodeling, that he is denying that Christ transforms human bodies into glorious ones. Burghardt cites this passage as evidence that the divine image has nothing to do with a "graving in Christ in us after the flesh" although he admits in n.74 that there is a problem here because Cyril insists that Christ will transform human bodies. I would suggest that what Cyril may well be condemning is the Origenist doctrine that at the resurrection human bodies will be spherical. Whatever the case maybe, I think unlikely that Cyril intended to affirm in the passage from *De recta fide ad Theodosium,* that risen and glorified bodies do not image Christ because our transfiguration in him is merely spiritual. It should also be pointed out that when Cyril speaks of our transfiguration or our spiritual birth he does not mean to affirm that this is something completely immaterial. In the *Commentary on John* it is clear that it is clear that Cyril's concept of *pneumatikos* does not exclude corporeality. Commenting on John 6:63 "The words that I have spoken unto you, they are Spirit and are life" Cyril writes:

> He fills whole his own body with the life-giving operation of the spirit. For he now calls the flesh spirit, not turning it aside from being flesh. But because by reason of it being perfectly united to him, and now endowed with his life-giving power, it ought to be called spirit too ... and not repudiating his own flesh does he say these things, but as teaching us what is the truth. (*Commentary on John,* Bk.4, Ch.3 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 436-437)

Here Cyril's understanding of *pneuma* includes corporeality freed from corruption and death by the transformative power of the death and resurrection of Christ.

[27] We have seen above, that Burghardt points to a passage in Cyril's *De sancta et consubstan-*

the facet of incorruptibility is dependent upon the whole Christ in his humanity and divinity. Humanity's conformation to the incorruptible, perfect humanity of the risen Christ does have reference to the renewal of the divine image to the extent that human bodies will come to reflect the incorruptibility of God. Any other interpretation can not do justice to Cyril's claims that 1) the gift of incorruptibility is given anew in the new creation through Christ, and 2) that the incorruptibility of the redeemed person, body and soul, images the imperishability and incorruptibility of God. The restoration of the divine image in humanity is not remote or independent from participation in the humanity of Christ. This participation for Cyril, as we have seen, takes place and is mediated in and through the eucharist.

There is another part of Burghardt's work that also points in the direction of our claim that for Cyril the renewal of the divine image in humanity involves, at least in part, a conformation to the humanity of Christ. Burghardt draws attention to Cyril's polemic against certain Egyptian monks who advocated an anthropomorphism which taught that if God fashioned human creatures into his image then it follows that God possesses a body. In reply to these monastic anthropomorphists, Cyril taught that the image and likeness of God cannot be corporeal because God is spirit. Thus, in his writings against the monks, Cyril located the image and likeness of God in the human soul and rejected the idea that the human body bore any resemblance to a corresponding divine body.[28]

---

tiali trinitate in order to show that the Alexandrian patriarch taught that Christ's renewal of the divine image in humanity is spiritual and does not involve our bodily conformation to Christ. Recalling the passage:

> "For *Christ* is formed in us, not as created in created, but as uncreated and God in created and produced nature, *engraving us anew in his own image through the Spirit, and transferring the creature, that is, us,* to the dignity that is above the creature."

This text must be understood in the context in which it appears. The passage above is part of a long argument that Cyril puts forth against the "Arians". The Alexandrian bishop is concerned for the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son. The point of his argument is that the divine image in us cannot be renewed, nor can we share in the divine nature if Christ is not fully divine, true God from true God. Cyril simply wishes to affirm that Christ renews his image in us and in doing so renews the divine image because he is fully divine. I cannot see how it could follow from all this that Cyril thereby taught that our bodily conformation to the risen Christ is not related to our divine imaging.

[28] Cyril, *Epistola ad Calosyrium* (for the critical edition see Pusey, *In Joannem* v.3, 604.) For an English translation see *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Letters 51-110,* tr.John McEnerney, *Fathers of the Church,* v.77 (Washington: Catholic University Press, 1987) 109-112.

But Burghardt notices that Cyril is not consistent in his claim that the soul alone is the locus of the divine image. We have seen above that Cyril also claims that the body is an key element in the divine imagining. Burghardt pointed out rightly that Cyril is guilty of failing to make a distinction because he asserts 1) that the divine image is to be found only in the soul and does not relate this to his claims that 2) the incorruptibility communicated to humanity through risen Christ images the incorruptibility proper to God and 3) that the incorruptibility of the human body will be modeled after the risen body of Christ. It is here, as Burghardt sees it, that Cyril fails to make a distinction: the image of God is not in the body in the sense that the body reflects a corresponding physical structure in God as the anthropomorphists claimed; rather the image of God is in the body insofar as the body shares in the incorruptibility of the risen Christ.[29] But here again Burghardt's observation that, for Cyril, the body does in fact image the divine argues against his claim that our bodily conformation to Christ has nothing to do with the divine image.

Cyril's claim that Christ restores the bodily dimension of the divine image in man is the working out of the radically Christocentric emphasis of his thought. To be sure, Cyril is not entirely consistent in this regard particularly when he argues against the anthropomorphists and impatiently passes over the need for distinctions.[30] Nevertheless, in regard to the divine image in humanity Cyril usually upholds his Christocentric emphasis upon the bodily aspect of the divine image in humanity. Furthermore, in claiming that Christ renews the bodily dimension of the divine image in humanity Cyril seems to suppose that Christ restores humanity "natural" or original life to live and exist in and through him. For if humans were not blessed in Christ or did not exist in Christ how then did the human body image God before the fall?[31] This seems to be where the logic of Cyril's thought is

[29] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 100-101.

[30] To my knowledge this is the only context where this inconsistency arises. Cyril's primary concern is to criticize the idea that God has a physical body.

[31] Cyril consistently maintains that Adam before the fall enjoyed bodily incorruptibility. For example see the *Commentary on John*, Bk. 9, Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 318-319; *In Joannem*, v.2, 484-485) where Cyril speaks of creation of the first man; Bk 12. Ch.1 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 686; *In Joannem* v.3, 147) where Cyril says that the resurrection of body will be in power and glory will return to its original purity; See also *Glaphyra in Genesim*, Bk.1, (P.G. 69, 28-29). These citations are only a sampling. Burghardt notices that Cyril specifically assigns incorruptibility to Adam's body prior to the fall in his work against Julian see *Contra Julianum*, Bk.3 (P.G. 76, 637)

directed. At any rate, Cyril's opinion that the divine image is in the body and it is renewed in Christ is more consistent with a christocentric view of creation than a non-christocentric one.

1) Christ and Adoptive Sonship

Another aspect of Cyril's concept of the divine image in man, which Burghardt addresses, is that of divine sonship. For Burghardt Cyril's understanding of adoption sonship illustrates the difference between humanity's original state and the redeemed condition. He notices that for Cyril human creatures become sons of the Father through participation in the Son through the Spirit. The Son of the Father is Son by nature while human creatures enjoy divine sonship by grace.

According to Burghardt this adoptive sonship, in Cyril's eyes, is the privilege of the Christian. It is communicated by the risen Christ alone and is given only after the fall. Therefore this aspect of the divine imaging is restricted to the Christian era.[32] Burghardt admitted that for Cyril, Adam had the Spirit of the Son and that the Spirit fashioned him to the Son and so to the Father.[33] Thus Burghardt drew the conclusion that Adam was thus a son in some way. Nevertheless he argued that Cyril did not think that Adam enjoyed sonship. Burghardt wrote:

> Adam was τέκνον, [child] yes; for every human being can call God Father by the twin titles of existence and image. Perhaps he was even υἱός in some sense; for he did have the Spirit of the Son. But θετός, no; for adoptive sonship is the priviledge of the Christian, to whom alone the risen Christ comunicates the Spirit of adoption.[34]

On the other hand Burghardt recognized that there are passages where Cyril speaks of Christ restoring sonship as well as passages which speak of a creation in the image of the Son and of the renewal of this image in Christ.[35] With few reservations, he follows the position of L. Janssens, who argued that Cyril consistently taught that the unfallen Adam lacked the grace of adoptive sonship given in Christ through the Spirit.[36] Even though God gifted Adam with the Spirit,

---

[32] See the entire discussion Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man,* 105-25

[33] Ibid, 141.

[34] Ibid, 142.

[35] Ibid., 118, n.46. Burghardt cites *Commentary on John,* Bk.1, Ch..9; *De sancta et substantiali trinitate,* dial.3 (P.G. 75, 837).*De Dogmatum solutione,* 4. For the critical edition *De sancta et substantiali trinitate,* see *Dialogues Sur La Trinité, Sources chrétienne,* v.237, ed. G.M. Durand (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1977) 100.

Adam remained at an "infinite distance from his creator."[37] What then of Cyril's claim that Christ recapitulates and restores humanity to its original state? Burghardt argues that Cyril's idea of the redemption is a restoration with an increase, the increase being a root kinship with God brought about by "the physical entrance of the Incarnate Word into humanity."[38] The risen Christ then communicates the Spirit of adoption (υἱοθεσίας) to the baptized. Thus adoptive sonship is limited to the "Christian era" or the "Christian economy."[39] Burghardt concedes that there is one difficulty here because there are texts where Cyril introduces Gen 1:27 into the context of adoptive sonship. But Burghardt contended that nowhere does Cyril say that the recovery of this primitive sonship is the recovery and return of the Spirit of adoption.[40] This whole interpretation is somewhat complex and is worth looking at in some detail.

Specifically, Burghardt argues that in the thought of Cyril there are two stages in adoptive sonship. There is the first stage where at the moment of the incarnation there is actualized in humanity a radical kinship with God. In the second stage the indwelling Spirit and participation in the eucharist establish in the individual in what Burghardt termed, "a properly supernatural relationship".[41] The Spirit conforms the individual to Christ and in the same Spirit the individual participates in the eucharist which in turn unites all believers in the body of Christ. Burghardt then submits that humanity's radical kinship with God (at the incarnation) is the necessary requirement for the supernatural relationship of the Spirit of adoption.

Cyril's comments on John 11:49-52 is the first text which Burghardt cited to support his claim that Adam did not share in adoptive sonship. There Cyril says:

---

[36] L. Janssens,"Notre filiation divine d'apres saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie" *Ephemeridies theologicae Lovanienses* 15 (1938): 233-78; G.M. de Durand, *Deux Dialogues Christologiques,* Sources chrétienne, v..92, admits the possibility that Cyril thought Adam enjoyed divine sonship before the fall. Nevertheless, according to De Durand, Cyril emphasizes this divine sonship mainly when he speaks about the restoration in Christ.

[37] Janssens, "Notre filiation divine d'apres saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie" 269. Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man,* 118 indicates his agreement with these conclusions.

[38] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man,* 115.

[39] Ibid., 113, 117.

[40] Ibid., 118 and n.46

[41] Ibid., 113.

> Caiaphas said that the death of Christ would be for the sake of the Jews alone; but [John] says that it was for all humanity. The point is, all of us are called God's race and children (γένος καὶ τέκνα), inasmuch as He is Father of all in that He engendered us by way of creation and brought into existence what did not exist. Still more, because we have the honor of having been made from the beginning after his image, and [the honor] of having obtained dominion over creatures of the earth ... But Satan scattered us ... and led man astray. ... However, Christ gathered us together once more and brought us all through faith into the one enclosure that is the church, and put us under one yoke: all have become one ... and are fashioned into "one new man" (Eph 2:15) and adore one God.[42]

In Burghardt's reading, Cyril here refers to two ways in which Adam could be labeled a child of God. First, Adam was created by the Father and secondly, this creation is in the image of God. Thus Adam, like anyone else can be considered a child of God. But Burghardt maintained that this does not warrant the conclusion that Adam partook of an adoptive sonship equivalent to the adoptive sonship given by Christ.[43] I suggest that neither does this text warrant the conclusion that Cyril meant to exclude this idea. Cyril observes here only that all human creatures are the Father's children and that they are made in his image and that Christ renews and recaptiluates all this. There is no reason to conclude that Cyril meant to contrast the blessing of being called a child of God given at creation with the Spirit of adoption given only in Christ.

The second text which Burghardt cited is taken from Cyril's *Commentary on Isaiah.* According to Cyril, when the prophet speaks of sons and daughters hurrying from the four regions of the earth, the prophet is "making manifest the time of Christ's coming, when the grace of adoption (υἱοθεσίας) through sanctification in the Spirit was given to those on the earth."[44] Cyril goes on to say that the Logos took flesh in order to "gather them into spiritual oneness through faith and sanctification, make them worthy of that kinship with Him which is finely perfected (τελουμένης εὖ μάλα καὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν οἰκειότητος), and in this way link them through himself to the Father."[45] Burghardt pointed to this as evidence that Cyril teaches an adoptive sonship which is unique and not given to Adam. He

---

[42] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.7. Here I follow Burghardt's translation. It should be pointed out here that this passage is taken from the catenae and its authenticity is not certain.

[43] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man,* 114.

[44] *In Isaiam,* Bk.4, 1 (P.G. 70, 888-889), Cyril commenting upon Isa 43:6. Here I follow Burghardt's translation in *The Image of God in Man,* 114.

[45] Ibid.

reasoned that Cyril does not say in this passage, as we might expect him to say, that the gift of the Spirit is restored nor does he say that adoptive sonship is restored. Cyril simply declares that the gift was given.[46]

But neither does this text justify the conclusion that Cyril excluded Adam from adoptive sonship. Cyril's remarks here clearly refer to the condition of humanity after the fall. There is no evidence to suggest that he intends to contrast the original state of Adam with the redeemed state of humanity. Cyril is entirely silent on that in this passage. I suggest that such silence does not justify the thesis that Cyril envisioned the redemption in Christ as a restoration with the addition of adoptive sonship or that this sonship was limited to the what Burghardt terms the "Christian era".

At this point Burghardt went on to identify what he believed is the precise distinction that accounts for the differences between the primitive state and the redeemed state. He maintained that humanity's redeemed state was superior to the state of Adam before the fall in several ways. He cited a text from Cyril's work *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate*[47] where Cyril says that the original condition of Adam was holy but far greater (πολὺ μεἰζων) is the condition of human life in Christ. Cyril also says in his *Commentary on Joel* that on the one hand the Spirit given to Adam was not preserved in humanity, but on the other hand that the Spirit remained in Christ and humanity is thereby established humanity "in a condition that is incomparably better (τὸ ἀσυγκπίτως ἄμεινον)."[48] Thus redeemed humanity's primary advantage over the pre-fallen state of Adam has to do with the fact that the former was constructed upon the incarnation and the latter was constructed upon the basis of creation. Burghardt cited Janssens with approval:

> It is from God, in so far as he is Creator, that Adam received the Spirit; and by reason of his instability he could lose the Spirit, and he actually did lose him for our whole nature. It is in our Savior, in so far as he is Word Incarnate, that we have obtained the Spirit as a stable gift, because Christ initially gave immutability to our nature in his divine person. In the new economy the communication of the Spirit exhibits a stability which it does not possess in the case of Adam, because our human nature is found more intimately united to the divinity by the

[46] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 114.

[47] Cyril, *De adoratione et cultu in spirit et veritate*. 17. (P.G. 68, 1076).

[48] Cyril, *In Joelem*, Bk .2 (Burghardt refers to the edition of P.E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas*. (Oxford, 1868) v.1, 338.

mystery of the incarnation than by the fact of creation. Here we have the deep-seated reason for the basic difference man's primitive condition and his state within the New Testament."[49]

This then is the increase and addition in recapitulation: "a root kinship with God." In addition to this there also increase in what Burghardt termed a "super-natural kinship." For Cyril, the Spirit illuminated the prophets but after the resurrection of Christ the Spirit dwells perfectly in the baptized.[50] Burghardt then cited Cyril's *Commentary on Luke*[51] where it is said that the Spirit of adoption was not in humans until Christ rose from the dead and and ascended into heaven. The authenticity of this passage is very doubtful[52] and it is clear from the context that the author of this passage meant to contrast the redeemed state with the fallen state rather than with the original state of creation. Burghardt continued on to argue that for Cyril what specifically communicated the Spirit of adoption upon the baptized is the physical mediation of Christ. To support this claim he cites a passage from the *Commentary on John:*

> ... it was in type that Israel was called to adoption through the mediation of Moses. That is why they were baptized into him, as Paul says, "in the cloud and in the sea" (1Cor 10:2) ... But they who mount to God's adoptive sonship by faith in Christ are baptized not into some created being but into the holy Trinity itself through the mediation of the Word, who links what is human to himself through the flesh which is united to him, and who linked naturally to the Father inasmuch as he is God by nature. That is how the slaves rises to sonship: through participation in the true Son he is called, and as it were ascends, to the dignity that belongs by nature to him. That is why we are called, and are, begotten of God; through faith we have received the regeneration that comes through the Spirit.[53]

According Burghardt it is clear from this passage that Cyril regarded the physical mediation of the Incarnate Logos as the necessary condition for the Spirit of adoption or adoptive sonship. Furthermore, Burghardt argued that, in Cyril's eyes, if the Logos were not incarnate he would not have communicated anything

[49] Janssens, "Notre filiation divine d'apres saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie" *Ephemeridies theologicae Lovanienses* 15 (1938): 269 as quoted and translated in Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man,* 115.

[50] Burghardt cites *Commentary on John,* Bk.5, Ch.2, (*In Joannem,* v.1, 697)

[51] Cyril, *Commentary on Luke,* Homily 38 (P.G. 72, 617-20)

[52] The *Clavis Patrum Graecorum,* ed. M. Geerard, v.3 (Brepolis-Turnhout, 1979) 5-6.The Clavis lists only three extant homilies from the Greek version of the *Commentary on Luke* which can be attributed with a high degree of certainty to Cyril.

[53] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.3, Ch.3 (I follow Burghardt's translation; *In Joannem,* v.2 135-136)

to human nature and if he were not God would not have communicated a participation in the divine nature. The logic of this position is clear enough: Adam did not enjoy adoptive sonship because he did not exist and live in and through the incarnate Logos who is the necessary condition for the communication of the Spirit of adoption. Burghardt concluded his argument with a lengthy quote from Janssens and indicates his agreement with the thesis that Cyril did not consider the unfallen Adam to have radical kinship with God.[54] Although Adam shared in the Spirit he was at an "infinite distance from the creator". This gap was only closed at the moment of the incarnation. Nowhere, in the estimation of Burghardt and Janssens, do we find in the writings of Cyril any indication that Adam received the Spirit of adoption. But Burghardt recognized a problem here. He admitted a difficulty which Janssens did not notice: Cyril introduced creation in the divine image (Gen 1:27) into the framework of adoptive sonship several times. Burghardt conceded that it is possible to conclude from these texts in isolation that adoptive sonship is a restoration to Adam's original condition. Burghardt refers three texts which are worth examining here.

In the *Commentary on John* Cyril says that humanity would not have been delivered from corruption:

> ... had not the beauty of the image of the heavenly been stamped on us through the vocation to adoptive sonship (υἱοθεσίαν); for, made partakers of him [Christ] through the Spirit, we have been sealed to His likeness and we mount up to the archetypal form of the image, according to which, Scripture says, we have been created as well. Once we have recovered in this fashion and with difficulty the primeval beauty of our nature, we shall be superior to the evils that have struck us in consequence of the transgression. And so rise to this supernatural dignity by reason of Christ ...[55]

In the *Dialogues on the Trinity* interpreting Gen 1:27 of the entire Trinity Cyril writes:

> we have been sealed to sonship through the Son in the Spirit; for the image of the Son is sonship, while the image of the Father is paternity ...We are God's image and likeness, molded thus to the whole supreme nature in the beginning ...[56]

---

[54] L. Janssens, "Notre filiation divine d'apres saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," 269. See also *The Image of God in Man,* 118.

[55] Cyril, *Commentary on John,* Bk.1, Ch.9. Emphasis mine. I follow Burghardt's translation.

[56] I follow Burghardt's translation of, *Dialogues on the Trinity,* dial.3 (P.G. 75, 837) See for the critical edition *Dialogues Sur Trinité,* Sources chrétiennes, v.231, (Paris: Editions du Cerf), 98.

Similarly, interpreting Gen 1:26 of the entire Trinity in *De Dogmatum solutione* Cyril declares:

> ... we have been made to the divine image, shaped as is to God. But if we must say something not improbable, we who were about to be called sons of God (ἡμᾶς μέλλοντας υἱοὺς ὀνομάζεσθαι θεοῦ) had to be made rather to the Son's image, in order that the distinctive mark of sonship (υἱότητος) too might be conspicuous in us.[57]

Burghardt speculated that Cyril's words "we who are about to be called sons" refers to future Christians. If this interpretation is correct then it is further support for Janssens thesis that Adam was not a son of God. Burghardt admitted the possibility that:

> "we" refers to human nature, to all men, that "about to be" looks forward simply to the next verse, Gen 1:27, and that consequently the sinless Adam as well as the redeemed Christian is a son of God."

Nevertheless, Burghardt argued that:

> However, Janssens might justifiably reply a) that adoptive sonship - and it is the Spirit of *adoption* that makes the difference- does not receive specific mention save in the first of these three texts; and b) that even in the first text Cyril does not state explicitly that the recovery of sonship is a return to a primitive *adoption*, a recovery of the Spirit of *adoption.*[58]

This argument that, for Cyril, Adam did not enjoy adoptive sonship prior to the fall in the final analysis is not persuasive. I submit that the evidence points in exactly the opposite direction. For the sake of clarity it is helpful to sum up Burghardt's claim. First of all, Burghardt acknowledges, in the passage from *Dialogues on the Trinity*, that Cyril clearly speaks of a sonship that is given at creation when humanity and thus Adam is created in the divine image: " ... we have been sealed into sonship through the Son in the Spirit: for the image of the son is sonship ...". Burghardt also recognizes in the passage from the *Commentary on John* that Cyril refers to recovery of a sonship but he argues that this is not the recovery of the spirit of adoption. The third passage from *De dogmatum solutione* speaks of humanity being made in the image of the son in order that the mark of sonship might appear in humanity. Here Burghardt concedes that the passage may well refer to Adam at creation and not simply to future Christians. The idea that

---

[57] I follow Burghardt's translation of *De Dogmatum solutione*, 4. For the critical edition see Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters*, 198.

[58] Burghardt, *The Image of God in Man*, 118-119 n.46. Emphasis is Burghardt's.

Cyril was referring to "christians to come" in this passage is completely unwarranted because of its context. The passage is best read in reference to the creation of humanity given that Cyril is interpreting Gen 1:26. At any rate, Burghardt admitted that for Cyril, Adam was endowed at creation with some sort of sonship but not one of the Spirit of adoption. The problem here is this: If Adam was a son, in any sense then he was an adoptive son. For Cyril there are two kinds of sonship: adoptive sonship and sonship by nature.[59] Adam at creation obviously could not have been a son by nature for then there would have been two sons of God which of course for Cyril is absurd. Adam could not have been a son without being adopted. If Adam was an adoptive son then he surely possessed what Burghardt and Janssens have called the "Spirit of adoption" because for Cyril no one is in the Son except through the Spirit.

Secondly, the claim that Adam's lack of a root kinship with God was the source of his exclusion from adoptive sonship as well as the basic reason for the difference between the primitive state and the redeemed condition is not persuasive claim. We saw that this argument involves the thesis that Adam lost the gift of Spirit due to his "instability" and because he lacked the intimate union to the divinity (root kinship) given to those in the redeemed state who through Christ receive the Spirit as a stable gift. This claim rests upon misunderstandings of several features in Cyril's thought including the insistence that only if Christ conquered as man, as the second Adam, did humanity share in his victory. We saw how Cyril emphasized this in his comments on John 16:33.[60] To be sure, for Cyril Christ, unlike Adam, preserves the Spirit as a stable and secure gift for the sake of humanity. But Christ does this freely as man. *Adam did not lose the spirit because he was "unstable" or because he lacked a root kinship with the divine or even because of an absence of intimacy with the divine. Adam lost the Spirit because he misused his freedom.* Cyril makes this clear in the *Commentary on John* in his comments on John 14:20. I have examined this passage in a previous

[59] Burghardt recognizes that Cyril makes this distinction but appears to lose sight of it particularly with regard to the nature of Adam's sonship. Earlier in his monograph cites as examples of this disitnction: *Thesaurus*, assertio 12, (P.G. 75, 189); *Commentary on John*, Bk.1, Ch.3 (*In Joannem*, v.1, 37).

[60] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.11, Ch.2 (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 477); *In Joannem*, v. 2, 657)
"If he conquered as God, then it profits us nothing; but if as man, we conquered in him. For he is the second Adam come from heaven according to the scriptures."

chapter showing how Cyril explained the incarnation in terms of recapitulation (*anakephalaiosis*). During the course of his remarks on John 14:20 the bishop of Alexandria also speaks of the creation of the first man and contends that the divine inbreathing did not become a soul. He continues on to teach about the fall of the first man:

> ... But whereas, being of free will, and entrusted with the reins of its own purposes - for this is also an element in the image, forasmuch as God has power over his own purposes - it [the soul of the first man] turned and has fallen - but how this came to pass the holy scripture must teach you, for the account of it therein is plain - God the Father both determined and took in hand to gather together once more the nature of man unto its ancient state, and willing it accomplished it thereby.[61]

For Cyril Adam abused his gift of free will, itself an aspect of the divine image, and fell away from the gift of the Spirit. What was needed then was a man who would receive the Spirit and who would freely choose to preserve the gift of the Spirit. Cyril spells this out in his comments on John 1:33-32 where he also discusses the fall Adam:

> For the Holy Spirit of wisdom will flee deceit, as it is written, nor dwell in the body that is subject to sin. Since then the first Adam preserved not the grace given to him of God, God the Father was minded to send us from heaven the second Adam. For he sends in our likeness his own son who is by nature without variableness or change, and wholly unknowing of sin, that as by the disobedience of the first, we became subject by divine wrath, so through the obedience of the second, we might escape the curse, and its evils might come to nothing. But when the Word of God became man, he received the Spirit from the Father as one of us (not receiving anything whatever for himself individually, [ουχ εαυτῷ τι λαμβανων ἰδικῶς] for he was giver of the Spirit) but that he who knew no sin, might, by receiving it as man, preserve it to our nature, and might again inroot in us the grace which had left us.[62]

This is all the consistent application of the theme that Christ was victorious as man, the second Adam, the man from heaven. For Cyril the human race does not simply receive the Spirit as stable gift because Christ communicates instability to human nature by virtue of his divine person. Again, the humanity of Christ is indispensable for Cyril because if Christ did not triumph freely as man then nothing has been communicated to humanity. Given all this, it is not accurate to claim then that for Cyril the basic difference that lies between Adam's primitive

[61] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.9, Ch.1, (tr. T. Randall, v.2, 319-320; *In Joannem*, v.2, 485)

[62] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.2, Ch.1 (tr. Pusey, v.1, 142; *In Joannem*, v.1, 184)

state and the redeemed state, and the root cause of Adam's deprivation of adoptive sonship has to with the gift of the Spirit being unstable in Adam because he lacked a intimate union with the divine.

One other issue remains. In our review of Burghardt's position we saw that in the *Commentary on John* Cyril claimed that the baptized rose to sonship through the reception of the Spirit and through participation in the flesh of Christ. Recalling Cyril remarks on John 1:31-32:

> But they who mount to God's adoptive sonship by faith in Christ are baptized not into some created being but into the holy Trinity itself through the mediation of the Word, who links what is human to himself through the flesh which is united to him, and who linked naturally to the Father inasmuch as he is God by nature. That is how the slaves rises to sonship: through participation in the true Son he is called, and as it were ascends, to the dignity that belongs by nature to him. That is why we are called, and are, begotten of God; through faith we have received the regeneration that comes through the Spirit.[63]

We have seen above that Cyril on several occasions spoke of a sonship that was given to humanity at creation, a sonship through the Son in the Spirit. The closest that Cyril ever comes to explicitly relating these claims in is the *Thesaurus* where he discusses humanity as blessed and founded in Christ from the beginning and rebuilt and reestablished in him after the fall. While Cyril never explicitly speaks of the sonship of Adam as something that was grounded in Christ, the logic of his thought moves in this direction given that he regarded Adam as a son by grace and also claimed that sonship depended upon participation in the flesh of Christ.

To sum up: I am not aware of any text in Cyril's works where it is asserted that Adam, prior to the fall, lacked a "root kinship" with God or stood at "a created distance from God." True, on occasion Cyril speaks of the redeemed condition as better than Adam's primitive state but he never, to my knowledge, indicates what precisely constitutes this advantage. At any rate, the claim that Adam did not possess "root kinship" with God cannot establish the thesis that Adam did not enjoy adoptive sonship. Furthermore, the texts which Burghardt cited, quoted above, where Cyril clearly teaches that sonship is an aspect of this divine image cannot be dismissed, on the basis of this claim, as referring to some other sort of sonship, "primitive" or otherwise. There is no compelling reason to

[63] Cyril, *Commentary on John*, Bk.3, Ch.3 (I follow Burghardt's translation; *In Joannem*, v.2 135-136)

suppose that when Cyril contends that Christ renews humanity to its beginning, that this beginning did not include adoptive sonship. The renewal of adoptive sonship, is consistent with the idea that Christ restores humanity to the beginning that it fell away from. I would suggest that it also highlights the inter-relatedness that Cyril saw between mystery of creation and the mystery of redemption.

C) Conclusion

We saw in previous chapters that for Cyril the praxis of the church's worship was fundamental for an authentic understanding of Christ. It was also shown that for Cyril salvation is recapitulation, that is the gathering together of humanity under the headship Christ who is the second Adam. This salvation is mediated through the worship of the church especially in the eucharist where the baptized partake of the life giving flesh of the second Adam and become his body.

In this view Christ mediates in his incarnate state. In other words, Christ is capable of worshipping, offering himself to the Father and showing humanity the pattern of worship not because he is a second rate god but because he is the eternal Son of the Father who emptied himself into flesh without ceasing to be God. For Cyril the humanity of Christ must be the humanity of the Son who is consubstantial with the Father otherwise Christ could not put humanity in communion with the Father. At the same time, the humanity of Christ is indispensable. For if the Son were not truly human he would have not communicated anything to the human race. For Cyril of Alexandria salvation and participation in the divine life is mediated through the humanity of Christ. We saw how this liturgical insight and experience informed the Christology in the *Commentary on John* which involved, of course, a focus and emphasis upon the historical Christ and his work and actions in history.

Cyril's focus on the historical Christ and his emphasis upon the mediation of life through the humanity of Christ led him at least one occasion to speculate about the role of Christ in creation. Cyril's speculation about humanity's creation in Christ, its fall from Christ and its recreation in Christ is consistent with his view that life is given in and through the humanity of Christ. It is equally consistent with his insistence that the mediating activity is located in the Son's incarnate state. Cyril realized, however dimly and inconsistently, that this insistence raised important questions in regard to the Son through whom all things came into being.

There are times when Cyril is blissfully unaware and unconcerned for the whole question of Christ's role in creation. All this of course leads to tensions in Cyril's thought manifested for example on the one hand, in Cyril's frequent assertion that recapitulation restores humanity to the beginning, and on the other hand in his occasional contention that the redeemed state is better than the beginning, the difference or the advantage not specified. Nevertheless, the emphasis upon Christ as mediating in his incarnate state also appears to have been presupposed, knowingly or unknowingly, in Cyril's understanding of incorruptibility and adoptive sonship, -- two important aspects of the divine image in humanity.

It must be acknowledged that Cyril did make remarks that are not consistent with the close unity he often supposes exists between creation and redemption. There are times usually in the heat of polemic against the "Arians" and others opposed to Nicene creed, when Cyril accepts the "Arian" state of the question which takes the Logos "before" his incarnation, or the Logos "before" he became man, as its theological point of departure. Whenever Cyril speaks of the Son before he became man and takes as his theological starting point the non-human Logos his theology runs into a real inconsistency. It violates his usual insistence that all sayings and actions of the Son of God, whether they befit his humanity or his divinity, are those of one person and are not to be attributed to the Son's divinity alone or to his humanity alone. We have seen that Cyril is adamant that the activity an experiences of Christ are those of one subject. There is no room, for example, in Cyril's thought for the notion that the humanity of the Son was born, suffered and died but that the Son of God was not born did not suffer and did not die. While Cyril thought it crucial to point out that the humanity or the divinity was the principle of this or that activity or experience he always insisted that the Son, the Word made flesh was the subject of this or that experience. But when Cyril speaks of the Son before he became man and implies that it was the non-human Son through whom all things came into being, he undermines his own insistence upon the communication of idioms. One cannot say then, for example, that the Son of Man came down from heaven or that the words in John 6:51 "before Abraham was I am" refers to Jesus or the Word in the flesh. Nor may one speak of Jesus as the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, the beginning and the end (Rev 22:13). For if the Son is non-human at creation then he, not Jesus the Christ, is the Alpha and the beginning and only the non-human Son is before Abraham. In this

scheme the mediating work of the Son at creation cannot but be located solely in the Son's divinity.

When Cyril claims that humanity is created in Christ it is then that he is most true to his insistence that Christ mediates as God-man. This claim, however inconsistently Cyril may uphold it, points the way to understanding creation as a Christian mystery that really has something to do with Christ. It suggests, too, that as a Christian mystery creation is not isolated or independent from the mystery of redemption and vice versa. A creation in Christ suggests that the mystery of Christ and redemption are two distinct moments in the Father's eternal plan which centers upon Christ. A plan and design that in final analysis is not determined nor frustrated by human sin but finds it fulfillment and completion in he who truly humanity's Alpha and Omega.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Cyril of Alexandria. *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum.* Patrologia graeca. ed. J.P. Migne v.69, 12-386.

________________ *Glaphyra in Exodum.* Patrologia graeca. ed. J.P. Migne, v.69, 386-538.

__________________ *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini epistolae tres oecumenicae, Libri V contra Nestorium, XII capitum explanatio, XII capitum defensio utraque, Scolia de incarnatione Unigeniti dialogus,De recta fide ad principissas, De recta fide ad augustas, Quod unus Christus dialogus, Apologeticus ad imperatorem.* ed. P. E. Pusey. Oxford, 1875.

__________________ *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini In D. Ioannis Evangelium. Accundunt fragmenta varia necnon tractatus ad Tiberium diaconum duo. De dogmatum solutione.* ed. P. E. Pusey. vv.1-3. Oxford, 1872.

________________ *Commentarii in Matthaeum.* ed. Joseph Reuss. *Matthäus Kommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche.* Texte und Untersuchungen. v.61, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957, 153-269.

__________ *De incarnatione unigeniti, Quod unus sit Christus,* (ed. and tr. G. M. deDurand.) *Deux dialogues christologiques,* Sources chrétiennes. v. 97. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1964.

__________ *Dialogues Sur La Trinité.* (ed. and tr. G.M. Durand.) Sources chrétiennes. v. 231-232, 246 Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1976

Translations

Pusey, P.E. tr. *Commentary on the Gospel according to S. John.* v.1. Oxford, 1884

Randall, Thomas. tr. *Commentary on the Gospel according to S. John.* v. 2. Oxford, 1885.

R. Payne Smith. tr. *A Commentary upon the Gospel of St. Luke by St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria.* Reprint ed. New York: Studion, 1983.

Newman, John Henry, Robinson, Archibald. tr. *Contra Arianos. Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.* v.4 (Athanasius) reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, (1892) 1956.

Wickham, Lionel. tr. *Select Letters of Cyril of Alexandria.* Oxford: University Press, 1983.

McEnerney, John. tr. *The Letters of Cyril of Alexandria. Fathers of the Church,* vv.76-77. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1987.

Secondary Sources on Cyril's Christology and Theology of the Eucharist.

Blanchette, Oliva. "St. Cyril of Alexandria's Idea of the Redemption," *Church History* 35 (1966): 139-156.

Burghardt, Walter. *The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria.* Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1957.

Chadwick, Henry. "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy," *Journal of Theological Studies* 2 (1951): 145-161.

Diepen, Herman. *Aux origines de l'anthropologie de saint Cyrilled'Alexandrie.* Paris: Desclèe de Brovwer, 1957.

_________ "La Christologie de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'anthropologie néo-platonicienne," *Euntes Docete* 9 (1965): 20-63.

Dries, J. van den. "The Formula of Saint Cyril of Alexandria ." Ph.D. dissertation, Gregorian University, 1939.

DuBarle, A.M. "L'ignorance du Christ dans saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses,* (janvier-mars, 1939)

Gebremedhim, Ezra. "Life-Giving Blessing: An Inquiry into the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria." Ph.D. dissertation, Uppsala University,1977.

Grillmeier, Alois. *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to the Council of Chalcedon (451).* tr. John Bowden. 2nd ed. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.

Harnack, Adolf von. *History of Dogma.* tr. Neil Buchanan. v. 6 New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.

Janssens, L. "Notre filiation divine d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Ephemerides theologicae Louvanienses,* 15 (1938): 233-278.

Joussard, G. "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et le schéma de l'incarnation verbe-chair," *Revue internationale de théologie,* 44 (1956): 234-242.

_________ "Une intuition fondamentale de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie en christologie dans le premiers année de son épiscopate," *Revue des études byzantines,* 10 (1953): 175-186.

___________ "Sainte Cyrille d'Alexandrie et le schèma verbe-chair," *Recherches de science religieuse,* 44 (156): 234-342.

___________ "Sainte Cyrille d'Alexandrie aux prises avec la communication des idiomes avant 428 dans les ouvrages antiarians," *Texte und Untersuchungen,* v.81 (1962): 112-121.

_________ "Un problèm d'anthropologie et de christologie chez saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Recherches de science religieuse, 43 (1955) 361-378.*

Jugie, Martin. "La Terminologie christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Echoes d'Orient*, 15 (1912): 12-27.

Koen, Lars. "Saving Passion: Incarnational and Soteriological Thought in Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on the Gospel according to John." Ph.D.dissertation. Uppsala University, 1991.

Langevin, G. "Le Thème de l'incorruptibilité dans in le commentaire de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie sur l'évangelie selon saint Jean". *Sciences écclésiastiques*, 8 (1956): 295-316.

_________ "La Doxa Du Christ Dans Cyrille," *Recherches De science religeuse,* 39 (1961): 69-94.

Liébaert, Jacques. *La doctrine christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne.* Lille, 1951.

_________ "Christologie: Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon (451)," *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte.* eds., M. Schmaus und Alois Grillmeier, v.3, pt. 1a, Freiburg: Herder, 1965.

_________ "L'evolution de la christologie de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie a partir de la controverse Nestorienne," *Mélange de science religieuse,* 27 (Avril 1970): 27-48.

_________ "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'unique prosopon du Christ aux origines de la controverse Nestorienne," *Melanges de science religieuse,* 34 (1977) 49-61.

Mahé, J. "L'Eucharistie d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue d'histoire écclésiastique,* 8 (1907): 677-696.

Margerie, Bernard de. "L'exégèse christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Nouvelle revue théologique,* 102 (1980): 400-425.

Manior, Herbert de. *Dogme et Spiritualité chez Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie.* Paris, 1944.

Michaud, E. "Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'eucharistie," *Revue internationale de theologie,* 10 (1902): 599-614, 675-692

Norris, R.A. "Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria," *Texte und Untersuchungen,* v. 116, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975: 254-268.

Rosini, R. "Il primogenitio in S. Cirillo Alessandrino," *Studia Patavina,* 12 (1965): 32-64.

Rehrmann, A. *Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien.* Hildesheim, 1902

Sani, Jules Basetti. "La docttrina del Primato di Gesu Cristo in S. Cirillo," in *Kyrilliana,* Guizeh. Egypte: Séminaire Franciscan Oriental, 1947.

Steitz, E. "Die Abendmahlslehre der Kirche," *Jahrebücher für deutsche Theologie,* 12 (1867): 235-245.

Siddals, Ruth. "Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria," *Journal of Theological Studies,* 38 (1987): 341-367.

__________ "Oneness and Difference in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria," *Studia Patristica,* 28 (1985): 207-211.

Struckmann, Adolf. *Die Eucharistie des heiligen Cyrill von Alexandria.* Paderborn, 1910.

Torrance, Thomas. "The Mind of Christ: The Problem of Apollinarianism and the Liturgy," in *Theology in Reconciliation.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Tour, Augustin La. "La doxa du Christ dans Saint Cyrille," *Recherches de science religeuse,* 38 (1960): 520-42.

Wickham, Lionel. "Symbols of the Incarnation in Cyril of Alexandria, " *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie.* Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Verlag, 1982, 41-53.

Unger, Dominic. "Christ Jesus the Secure Foundation according to Cyril of Alexandria," *Franciscan Studies,* 7 (1947): 1-25; 324-343; 399-414.

Weigl, Eduard. *Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien.* Mainz, 1905.

Wilken, Robert. *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

__________ "Exegesis and History," *Church History* 34 (1966): 139-156.

__________ "Homo Futurus." Unpublished Ph.D.dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.

Other Secondary Sources

Berthold, George. "Cyril of Alexandria and the Filioque," *Studia Patristica*, v.19. Leuven: Peeters, 1987 143-147.

Butterworth, Robert. *The Theology of Creation.* Notre Dame, In: Fides Publishers, 1969.

Cassell, David J. "Cyril of Aelxandria and the Science of the Grammarians: A Study in the Setting, Purpose, and Emphasis in Cyril's *Commentary on Isaiah*" Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Virginia, 1992.

Greer, Rowan. *The Captain of Our Salvation: A Study in Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews.* Tubingen: Mohr, 1973.

Joussard, G. "L'activité littéraire de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie jusqu'à 428," *Mélanges Podechard Lyon,* 1945 159-174.

________ "La date des éscrits anti-ariens de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue benedictine* 87 (1977): 172-178.

Kelly J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines.* New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Kerrigan, Alexander. *Cyril of Alexandria: Interpreter of the Old Testament.* Rome: Pontifico Istituto Biblico, 1952.

______________ "The Objects of the Literal and Spiritual Sense of the New Testament," *Studia Patristica, Texte und Untersuchungen.* v.43, Berlin: Verlag Akademie, 1957: 354-374.

Lubac, Henri de. *Catholicism.* tr. Sr. Elizabeth Englund. San Francisco Ignatius Press, 1988.

____________ *Corpus Mysticum.* Paris: Aubier, 1948.

___________ *Sources of Revelation.* tr. Luke O'Neill. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.

Mahé, J. "La sanctification d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 8 (1909): 30-40; 469-492.

Malley, William. *Hellenism and Christianity.* Rome: Gregorian University, 1978

McCoy, Jerry. "Philosophical Influences on the Doctrine of the Trinity in Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria," *Encounter* 38 (1977) 362-391.

Meijerin, E.P. "Cyril of Alexandria on the Platonists and the Trinity," *Nederlands Theologie Tijdschrift* 20 (1974) 16-29.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600).* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Rahner, Karl. *The Trinity.* tr. Joseph Donceel. New York: Herder, 1970.

__________ *Foundations of Christian Faith.* tr. William Dych. New York: Crossroads, 1977

Reuss, Joseph. "Iohannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche," *Texte und Untersuchungen.* v. 89, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1966, 188-195.

Sellers R.V. *Two Ancient Christologies: A Study in the Christological Thought of the Schools of Alexandria and Antioch in the Early History of Christian Doctrine.* London, 1946.

Schwartz, Eduard. "Cyril und der Mönch Victor," *Weiner Akademie-Sitzungsberichte* v.204, chap.4. Wein, 1928.

Wiles, Maurice. *Spiritual Gospel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Wong, Joseph. *Logos-Symbol in the Christology of Karl Rahner.* Rome: Libreria Ateneo Salesiano, 1984.

Young, F.M "Christological Ideas in the Greek Commentaries in the Epistles to the Hebrews, " *Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1969): 120-163.

________ *From Nicea to Chalcedon.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Index